UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

'To Lay the Shining Foundation…': The Tradition of the Persian Wars in Classical Greek Poetry

by ©

Kelly Anne MacFarlane

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

In Classics

Department of History and Classics

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2002

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-81234-0

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Kelly Anne MacFarlane

Title of Thesis: "To Lay the Shining Foundation…": The Theme of the Persian Wars in Classical Greek Poetry

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2002

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

B404 S. Rawlings Street
Carbondale, Illinois
62901
U.S.A.

Ag. 16, 2002

'The War'—like any other war—will come and go and be parenthesized by dates in history books. A war is just a noise—the stench of death—a view, however wide or brief, of rubble—and a cause for lamentation.

After the lamentation: praise. Over the rubble: shrines. After the stench of death: the sweetness of flowers. After the noise: the diminishing echo.

Timothy Findley, *Famous Last Words*, 176.

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "To Lay the Shining Foundation…': the Theme of the Persian Wars in Classical Greek Poetry" by Kelly Anne MacFarlane in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of PhD in Classics.

Frances Skoczylas Pownall

Christopher G. Brown

Martin Cropp
Martin J. Cropp

Aara L Suksi
Aara Suksi

Deborah Boedeker
Deborah Boedeker

Richard A. Young

August 8, 2002

Parentibus Meis

ABSTRACT

This dissertation considers the various treatments of the Persian Wars (490; 480-479 B.C.) as they appear in different poetic genres in Greece during the Classical period.

Chapter One treats the lyric and elegiac accounts of Simonides and Pindar, who were among the first to compose poetic praise of the victors and consolation for the fallen. The narratives of Simonides, written for Spartan and panhellenic audiences, offer a useful counter-balance to the primarily Athenian accounts in the other authors. For the most part, the works of Simonides, which were composed shortly after the Wars for performance at venues intended to commemorate the victories, are concerned with consoling the survivors, whereas other poets tend to concentrate on the victories themselves.

Chapter Two looks at the tragedians Aeschylus and Phrynichus and their dramatizations of the Wars on the Athenian public stage. In Aeschylus, we can see the origins of the image of the Persian as "Other" and the development of a view of Athenian superiority that was based on the city's role in the defeat of the Persians.

The next two chapters examine a revival of the theme after the Wars had ceased to be discussed by contemporaries. The epic poet Choerilus of Samos (Chapter Three) was the first poet to revisit the theme. His decision to take up this unusual topic seems to be connected with his desire to find novelty at a time when the genres of the late fifth century seem to have been played out: in addition to treating a topic that had long been out of fashion, he composed in the form of epic poetry, a genre that had not been used for some time. Timotheus of Miletus (Chapter Four) had a similar interest in poetic novelty, adapting the emergent style of the New Music to the old theme.

I examine these accounts to determine the effect of the genre on the poet's approach to the Wars, the debt of the treatments to their poetic predecessors, and the place of each account within its historical circumstances.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is my pleasure to record my thanks to my friends, colleagues, and advisors for their help throughout my degree programme.

My supervisors, Frances Pownall and Christopher G. Brown, were instrumental in bringing the thesis to completion. Apart from Chris Brown's work on my thesis, he also sparked my interest in Greek poetry in general and the lyric poets in particular when I took my Master's at Western. Fran Pownall's role went far beyond what was originally envisaged and she became a supervisor in terms of content and not simply in terms of administrative matters.

My thesis improved considerably thanks to the keen eyes, careful reading, and pointed criticisms of my committee members, Martin J. Cropp and Aara Suksi. The external reader, Deborah Boedeker, brought up a number of interesting points to improve the clarity and argument of my thesis and also to consider for future study.

I owe a special debt to Christopher S. Mackay, whose unstinting confidence in my ability to finish this thing helped me get through the moments when I thought I couldn't.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents and dedicate this work to them in loving gratitude for everything they've done for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
  The Persian Wars in the Poets 5
  The Persian Wars in Herodotus 9
  The Persian Wars in the Orators 11
  "Myth" vs. "History" 14
  The Value of Poetry As Evidence 18
  The Nature of the Commemorative Poems 23
  Review of Scholarship 25
  Summary 35
Chapter 1: Lyric and Elegy (Simonides And Pindar) 37
  Pindar Frr. 76-7 Snell-Maehler 39
  Simonides' Literary and Historical Context 42
  The Evidence for Simonides and its Limitations 50
  Simonides: The Poems 56
    I: The *Battle of Marathon* 56
    II: The *Battle of Artemisium* 56
    III: The *Battle of Salamis* 70
    IV: The *Battle of Plataea* (Frr. 10-17 [18?] *IEG*^{2}) 73
    V: *For the Dead of Thermopylae* 78
  Conclusions 91
Chapter 2: Tragedy: (Phrynichus and Aeschylus) 93
  The Social and Literary Context of Tragedy 93
  The Nature of the Evidence 96
  The Plays of Phrynichus 105
    I: *Sack of Miletus* 105
    II: *Phoenissae* (*Persae*?) 113
  The Plays of Aeschylus 117
    I: *Persae* 117
    II: *Oreithyia* 135
  Conclusions 137
Chapter 3: Epic (Choerilus) 140
  Choerilus' Literary and Historical Context 140
  Herodotus' *Histories* and Choerilus' *Persica* 155
  The Evidence for the *Persica* 157
  The Scope and Content of the *Persica* 160
    I: The Campaigns of Darius 162
    II: The Campaigns of Xerxes 171
    III: The Campaigns of Cyrus 185
  Choerilus' Approach to the Persian Wars 193
  The Place of Performance 209
  Conclusions 212
Chapter 4: The New Music (Timotheus) 214

- Timotheus' Literary and Historical Context 215
- The Evidence for the *Persians* 222
- The Scope and Content of the *Persians* 227
- Analysis of the *Persians* 238
- The Date and Place of First Performance 251
- Conclusions 271

Conclusion 274

Bibliography 283

Appendix A: Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* 300

Appendix B: the *Suda* s.v. Choerilus of Samos 302

INTRODUCTION

Poetry had a central role in Greek society in private and public spheres. Voices and instruments, alone or in combination, accompanied the Greeks almost literally from cradle to grave and were present at virtually every point in between.[1] Music soothed babies in the form of lullabies. It entertained at symposia where the guests could participate in the drinking songs or else simply enjoy those of the professional entertainers. Music accompanied the bride at weddings and lamented the dead at funerals. Hymns celebrated the gods at religious festivals, which also featured musical competitions. Music was so important that the ability to sing and play the lyre was considered to be the mark of an educated and cultured man, while the inability to do so was cause for concern. Furthermore, music extended even beyond the grave where the better afterlife enjoyed only by the heroes or the blessed Initiates is characterized by the presence of music and the ability to enjoy it.[2]

Greek society was what John Herington terms a "song culture," that is, a "society whose prime medium for the expression and communication of its most important feelings and ideas was song."[3] Indeed, poetry was the first literary form to treat significant events and that it continued to do so for centuries.[4] The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* commemorated the deeds of the great heroes, the *Theogony* the nature of the universe and the ways of the gods, while the *Works and Days* rationalized and justified the lot of mortals. Music regulated the soldier's maneuvers while on-duty, entertained them when off-duty, exhorted them to fight well, and immortalized their achievements when the battle was done. It is the poetic commemoration of war, in particular the Persian Wars, that is the focus of my thesis. The Persian Wars were a watershed event for the Greek mainland and readily lent themselves to poetic commemoration. I will examine the poetic accounts of the Persian Wars in order to explore the role of poetry in creating and preserving knowledge of the Persian Wars and the role of poetic genres in shaping the accounts of the Wars.

---

[1] It is unfortunate that, with few exceptions, all that survives of ancient Greek music is the poetic text. For transcriptions and discussion of the few surviving scores, see John G. Landels, *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 218-63 and M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 277-326. For a general survey of the widespread role of music in Greek society, see the first chapters of both Landels and West.

[2] On the importance of music to education, see Plato, *Laws* 654a-b, *Republic* 376e, and Aristophanes *Clouds* 961-1023; for the presence of music in the afterlife, see Pindar, fr. 129 Maehler.

[3] John Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 3.

[4] Since the musical scores are lost, I will use the term "poetry" rather than "song" to refer to the texts under discussion.

The Persian Wars were the two invasions of mainland Greece by the Persian Empire. In 490 BC, the Persian Empire, with Darius as King, invaded the Greek world seeking to punish Greek incursions into Persian territory and planning to expand their own Empire.[5] The Persian army landed at the plains of Marathon where they were met by the Athenian hoplite army and a small number of Plataean soldiers. The Persians were quickly defeated and retreated. In 480, under the personal leadership of Xerxes, Darius' son and successor, the Persians again advanced against mainland Greece with the intention of conquering it. In recognition of the threat, many city-states united against the common enemy. The newly-formed Greek alliance decided to oppose the Persians on two fronts: the Spartan army and allies at Thermopylae, and the allied navy, dominated by the Athenians, at Artemisium. The army held out for three days at Thermopylae before being outflanked through treachery; having dismissed the majority of their allies in the face of imminent and inevitable death, the Spartans remained and were massacred virtually to a man. Almost simultaneously, the allied fleet engaged in a series of battles against the Persians at Artemisium and inflicted severe damage on the Persians while suffering heavy casualties themselves. Hearing news of the disaster at Thermopylae, the Greek fleet decided to withdraw towards Attica. They then drew up at Salamis where they met the Persians with great success. They almost completely destroyed the Persian fleet and forced Xerxes himself to flee to Ionia while leaving behind a reduced force. The Persians then withdrew for the winter. Returning in 479, their land-forces were decisively defeated at Plataea by the Greek army under Spartan leadership, while their navy was destroyed at Mycale. The remnants of the Persian army retreated to Persia, their plans for conquest at an end.

---

[5] Unless otherwise noted, all dates are BC. Notwithstanding a growing trend towards a more faithful

Each society responds to its wars, and its defeats and victories therein, in the way it thinks those events deserve. For some wars, the official or popular reaction can be immediate and favourable; for others, it is immediate but distancing as a society, either officially or popularly, attempts to distance itself from its participation in a war. For still others, a society's reaction can change over time, reflecting efforts to rehabilitate the winners or losers of a war. A society can communicate its views of its participation and deeds in various wars through a variety of media. It can express itself positively, by commissioning public art, monuments, and poetry, or negatively, by denying its wars any form of commemoration.[6]

---

transliteration from Greek to English I will use the more familiar, Latinized, spelling.

[6] One dramatic method of preventing commemoration is to forbid public discussion of the events. One such instance occurred in Athens: ca. 494 the Athenians, who did not want to be reminded of unpleasant events, banned future productions of Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus* (Hdt. 6.21.2).

In the case of the Persian Wars Athens and, to a lesser degree, Sparta immortalized the Wars and their role in them in a variety of poetic genres.[7] Simonides celebrated the achievements of the Spartans (et al.) in both lyric and elegiac forms. Poetic accounts of the Wars were more popular in Athens where Pindar treated the Wars in lyric form, Phrynichus and Aeschylus composed tragedies for the stage, Choerilus of Samos performed his epic, and Timotheus of Miletus used an emerging musical style to celebrate the victory. The extant Athenian record suggests that poetic involvement with the Wars lasted from the immediate aftermath of the Wars until at least the end of the fifth century; the evidence in praise of Sparta is restricted to the early half of the fifth century. This provides a rich body of evidence that can be used to consider a number of interrelated questions concerning the role of poetry in commemorating significant events and shaping public opinion about those events.

Many of the poems celebrating the Persian Wars were official and community-oriented documents; therefore, they speak to the Greeks' perception of the Wars and of their role therein. An examination of poems performed before Spartan and Athenian audiences can shed light on a number of issues: how the two city-states conceived of their own participation and that of other city-states in the Wars; whether there were common elements in the treatment of the Wars that transcended partisan concerns or whether the treatment differed from city-state to city-state; the relationship of poetry to prose histories; and how the poetic accounts contributed to the later perception of the Wars found in the Athenian orators. In addition to questions concerning the popular and official image of the Persian Wars, such an examination can adumbrate key questions concerning poetry itself: how the genres in which the poets wrote affected their approach to and treatment of the Wars; and how the temporal distance—that is, the amount of time that had passed between the events and the poem—and the spatial distance—that is, the performance venue—of the poets and their audiences from the events narrated affected the poets' approach to the Wars.

---

[7] By "genre" I mean those "familiar patterns that typically produce certain contexts and effects" (Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink, "Introduction," in *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, eds., Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000], 7). I consider the issue of genre in more detail at page 22.

THE PERSIAN WARS IN THE POETS

The Persian Wars had a significant effect on the literature of the Greek world as the Wars were commemorated, explicitly and at length, in poetry of various genres and over several decades. It is this poetry that will form the basis for my thesis.

One of the earliest extant poets to treat the Wars was Simonides of Ceos. The various battles of the Wars formed the subject of several of Simonides' lyric and elegiac poems; the majority of his poems were likely composed for public celebrations shortly after the Greek victory. As well, there are many short elegies and epigrams attributed, with varying degrees of accuracy and confidence, to Simonides. Prior to 1992, there were extant only a few sparse fragments of Simonides' poems on the Persian Wars and tantalizing references to others in the ancient sources; now, thanks to the discoveries at Oxyrhynchus, we also have new substantial, albeit lacunose, elegiac fragments.[8] This papyrus, known colloquially as the "New Simonides," includes a narrative of the battle of

---

[8] E. Lobel, "3965. Simonides: *Elegies*," *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 59 (1992): 4-49.

Plataea.[9] It is our best evidence for the existence and nature of elegies treating events of recent history.[10] Furthermore, since the majority of the poems on the Persian Wars were written for an Athenian audience and so have an Athenian slant to them, the Plataea elegy, which narrates a primarily Spartan victory, is a welcome contrast. In particular, the elegy highlights the Spartan role (as suggested by the references to Sparta and several prominent Spartans) and Spartan martial ideology.

Following the defeat of the Persians, the Athenian tragedians Phrynichus and Aeschylus composed tragedies on the Wars, devoted to the Athenian victory at Salamis. Although Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* is lost, there is anecdotal evidence suggesting strong similarities between it and Aeschylus' *Persae*.[11] Previously, Phrynichus had composed a play on the fall of Miletus immediately following that disaster. Unfortunately the *Sack of Miletus* is also lost. Despite these losses, we are nonetheless able to come to certain conclusions regarding the content of the plays, their reception, and the Athenian perception of their role in the Wars.

Choerilus of Samos wrote a lengthy and detailed epic, the *Persica* (*SH* 316-23), in which he treated the Wars possibly ranging from the invasion of Darius to the defeat of

---

[9] The "New Simonides" is more formally known as *POxy*. 2327 and *POxy*. 3965. It consists of fragments of an anthology containing elegiac poems by Simonides and including an elegy on the battle of Plataea. The title "The New Simonides" has been established by its use as the title of the panel devoted to the elegies at the 1994 meeting of the APA, for the special *Arethusa* volume (ed. D. Boedeker and D. Sider, v.29; 1996) in which the papers from the APA were published, and by its presence, in several languages, in titles of articles on the elegies. The papers from the *Arethusa* volume have been updated and appear, along with several new and updated papers, in *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, eds., Deborah Boedeker and David Sider (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[10] For the existence of elegies narrating historical events, see page 26.

[11] For evidence for the similarities between Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* and Aeschylus' *Persae*, see pages 113-114. The title of Phrynichus' play with similarities to Aeschylus' *Persae* has been called into question (see n.46). I will however retain the traditional name, *Phoenissae*.

Xerxes.[12] Only a few lines of Choerilus' poetry are extant. There are nineteen lines of the *Persica*, spread out over seven fragments (*SH* 321 is not a fragment of the Persica but rather contains a reference to its content), the longest of which are two five-line fragments; in addition, there are four lines tentatively ascribed to the *Persica*. Choerilus has also been claimed as author of several fragmentary papyrus texts containing hexametric poetry suggestive of the Persian Wars.[13] What does remain is informative for Choerilus' approach to the poetic tradition and the tradition of the Persian Wars.

Finally, near the end of the fifth century, Timotheus of Miletus wrote a citharoedic *nomos*, conventionally called the *Persians* (*PMG* 788-91), celebrating the Athenian victory at Salamis.[14] The approximately 240 surviving lines consist of a series of vignettes describing, in colourful detail, the defeat of the Persians largely from the point of view of the Greek-created Persians. The *Persians* was performed at Athens prior to 398 and won for Timotheus a long-awaited victory in a musical competition.[15] The poem and Timotheus' success with it attest to the enduring significance of the Persian Wars in general, and Salamis in particular, to an Athenian audience.

In addition to providing the subject for several extended poetic treatments, the Persian Wars, and in particular the battles of Marathon and Salamis, provided popular

---

[12] Although there was some inconsistency regarding the title of Choerilus' poem in antiquity, I will refer to it as the *Persica*, the most common title currently in use. Unless otherwise noted, I will follow H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983) for the text of and testimonia about Choerilus.

[13] The papyrus fragments are *POxy*. 2524 frr. 1-8 (= frr. 14-21 Colace), *PFr*. inv. 12 (=fr. 22 Colace), *POxy*. 2814 (=fr. 23 Colace) and *PMichael*. 5 vv.9-28 (= Appendix B Colace).

[14] I will refer to Timotheus' *nomos* as *Persians* to prevent any confusion between it and Aeschylus' *Persae*.

[15] The exact circumstances of the first performance of Timotheus' *Persians* are unknown; we can infer his public performance and victory from the later reputation of his poem, and his previous lack of critical success from the anecdotes concerning his despondency over his frequent musical failures.

topoi for poets seeking to praise Athens.[16] Aristophanes made frequent reference to Marathon and the Marathonomachoi as indicative of the glory days of Athens; references to Salamis also occur, but are less frequent.[17] *Wasps* (produced 422) provides a somewhat muddled history of the Persian Wars, mingling together events from Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis, and Mycale (1071-90). Colin Austin asserts that the events of the later battles are "mere details added to give colour" to a narrative that focuses on Marathon.[18] The very profusion of these details, so intrusive as to detract from the prominence of Marathon, suggest that they are not simply colourful details but instead serve to call to the mind of the audiences the other victories in the Persian Wars. The passage, rather than focusing on Marathon, mixes events of both invasions, placing the victories in the two invasions on equal footing, and so demonstrates the continuing popularity of the Wars and the equal importance of Salamis.

The references and allusions to the Persian Wars in Aristophanes, while indicative of the enduring significance of the Wars to Athens, will not be the major focus of my thesis. Instead, the main focus will be the extended narrative of Aeschylus and what survives of the similarly extended narratives of Simonides, Phrynichus, Choerilus, and Timotheus. Their lengthy discussions and descriptions offer greater avenues for exploration of the popular perception and treatment of the Persian Wars than do brief allusions.

---

[16] A useful comparandum for the cultural and psychological importance of the Athenian role at Marathon and Salamis to the Athenians is the significance of the Battle of Vimy Ridge (1917) to Canadians: using Canadian ingenuity and innovative tactics, the Canadian Corps succeeded in taking the most heavily defended and strategically most important German bastion and, as a consequence, Canada came of age as a nation. To the Allies, Vimy was a sidebar to the British Battle of Arras and scarcely merited separate mention (Pierre Berton, *Vimy* [Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986]).

[17] For references to Marathon and the *Marathonomachoi*, see *Acharnians* 178-85 and 692-701, *Knights* 781 and 1334, *Clouds* 985-6, and *Wasps* 711; for Salamis, see *Lysistrata* 59 and 411, *Knights* 781-5, and *Eccleziazusae* 38.

[18] Colin Austin, "The *Wasps* of Aristophanes" [review of MacDowell's Oxford commentary], *CR* n.s. 23 [1973]: 134.

THE PERSIAN WARS IN HERODOTUS

Herodotus' *Histories* was the first prose account of the deeds of contemporary men and is arguably the most well-known account of the Persian Wars. He examined the events of the Wars, their underlying causes, and the principal players in great detail, combining his account of the Wars with an ethnographic and anthropological look at the cultures involved. His is also the most comprehensive account of the Persian Wars, treating not simply the individual battles in isolation, as is often the case with the poets, but rather the entirety of the Wars.

In view of its detail and comprehensiveness, the *Histories* has, understandably, taken pride of place in discussions of the Persian Wars. A R. Burn, for whom Herodotus "far outweighs all the other sources," bases his study of the Wars primarily on the historian, relegating Simonides and Phrynichus to a few brief mentions and omitting Choerilus and Timotheus entirely; the more substantial Aeschylus fares somewhat better.[19] J.F. Lazenby shows a similar dependence on Herodotus, stating, "apart from Herodotos there is not much evidence to consider."[20] Lazenby's interest in the poets is restricted to their potential contribution to Herodotus' *Histories* and, consequently, they receive little mention. Richmond Lattimore does consider in detail the evidence from Aeschylus' *Persae* compared to that of Herodotus, in particular that of the roster of

---

[19] A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks: the Defence of the West, c. 546-478 B.C.* (London: Duckworth, 1984), quotation p. 3. Admittedly, earlier historians had less of Simonides with which to work.

[20] J.F. Lazenby, *The Defence of Greece: 490-479 B.C.*, (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1993), 5.

Persian combatants, and concludes that Aeschylus' account is somewhat lacking in historical accuracy.[21] Nevertheless, the accounts of Aeschylus and, to a lesser extent, those of Simonides and Phrynichus, can offer insight into the goals of Herodotus' *Histories*.[22]

In his proem, Herodotus clearly states his goals: ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται, "lest the deeds of men become extinct through time, and lest the great and wondrous deeds displayed by the Greeks and the Barbarians be unknown."[23] His goal is reminiscent of poetry and its role in preserving the *kleos aphthiton* ("undying fame") of heroes. Herodotus then devotes great effort to ensuring that outcome. Herodotus adopted the role of poetry for his prose history; both genres were intended to preserve future memory of past events. Herodotus' *Histories*, the value of its detailed accounts of the various battles, and Herodotus' explicit commemorative aim have naturally tended to overshadow consideration of the largely incomplete poetic accounts of the same events and their implicit—and occasionally explicit (e.g., Simonides' elegy on Plataea)—desire to ensure the survival of these same great deeds.

---

[21] Richmond Lattimore, "Aeschylus on the Defeat of Xerxes," in *Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather (*Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943), 84-7.

[22] Deborah Boedeker argues convincingly that, although there were differences in the function of the two works, Simonides' Plataea poem exerted a literary influence on Herodotus' *Histories* ("Heroic Historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 120-34).

[23] Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own.

THE PERSIAN WARS IN THE ORATORS

The Persian Wars understandably had a great effect on the mindsets of the various Greek city-states that fought in the Wars; chief among them were Athens and Sparta. Not only had the Greeks defeated a numerically superior enemy against overwhelming odds, but also the disparate city-states that make up mainland Greece had put aside their political differences to unite against the common enemy. Following the Greek victory, images of Persians and the Persian Wars began to appear in public art, both plastic and literary. By the fourth century, the Athenian role in the Persian Wars had become a tool for the Attic orators to justify Athenian superiority. Their presentation of the Wars owes a debt to the poetic accounts. That the orators were able to use the Wars as they did suggests that by the fourth century there was a standard history and perception of the Wars at Athens. The survival of popular knowledge of the Wars is due in part to poetry's role in preserving the memory of the Wars and to Herodotus' adoption of poetry's commemorative role.

Two standard themes recur in the orators' accounts of the Persian Wars: Athens alone saved the Greek world from the Persians and this in turn justified Athenian supremacy; and the Persians were Barbarians, that is to say, distinctly different from, if not precisely opposite to, Athenians in particular and Greeks in general. These elements can be traced back at least to Aeschylus' influential presentation of the battle of Salamis and the Persians in his *Persae*; Choerilus and Timotheus display a similar view.

The political use of the Persian Wars was especially prominent in funeral orations, a uniquely Athenian institution.[24] The Athenian war dead were publicly, officially, and collectively praised by Athens at a communal state-sponsored funeral. Athens selected its most prominent statesman to deliver a eulogy; the effect of this eulogy was to praise not only the dead, but also the city for which they died.

John Ziolkowski analyzed the form of the funeral orations, concluding that they follow a standard pattern: proem, *epainos*, *paramythia*, and epilogue.[25] Of particular interest are the *epainos*, in which the dead are praised, and the *paramythia*, in which the living are consoled. Within the *epainos* praise of the dead and praise of their ancestors would appear. Within the *paramythia* would appear consolation of the living: the orator would stress the good fortune of the dead for having died so gloriously; assure the living that they were fortunate in having such kin; and exhort them to live up to the example set by the dead.[26] As we will see, similar elements of consolation appear in those poems that were performed either close in time to the Persian Wars or else on occasions dedicated to the fallen.

The Wars were popular as a *topos* to indicate the superiority of Athenian culture and accomplishments. This is apparent in the accounts of the battle of Marathon, where the orators, often sweeping aside or downplaying the contribution of the Plataeans, claim that Athens was first to dare to stand against the Persians, and that Athens alone defended the Greek world (e.g., [Lys.] 2.20-6; Dem. 40.10; Isoc. *Paneg.* 86). A similar view is taken of the Athenian role during Xerxes' invasion and the subsequent defeat of the Persians ([Lys.] 2.32-44; Dem. 40.10-11; Isoc. *Paneg.* 93-6 and *Panath.* 49-52).

---

[24] For a cogent discussion of the Athenian creation of the funeral oration and the reciprocal role of funeral orations in creating Athens and the Athenian, see Nicole Loraux, *Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986).

[25] John E. Ziolkowski, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* (New York: Arno Press, 1981), esp. 174-207.

[26] Ziolkowski 1981, 178-9.

The orators often display a greater emphasis on the victory at Marathon than on the victory at Salamis. Nicole Loraux has taken this as evidence for a hierarchy of victories, with Marathon, the victory of the aristocracy and the hoplite army, surpassing that of Salamis, the victory of the radical democracy and the "oars people."[27] As evidence, Loraux cites the emphasis on Marathon in the orators, and in Aristophanes.[28]

Rosalind Thomas, however, disagrees. Although she too sees a greater emphasis on Marathon, she sees it moving to the forefront for different reasons. The primacy of Marathon is not the result of an ideological conflict between aristocratic hoplite army and the common sailor. Rather, it is the result of Athens' telescoping of the Persian Wars: Athens plays up their role at Marathon, where they won essentially single-handedly, and downplays the invasion of Xerxes, which was defeated by a panhellenic force.[29]

The poetic accounts of the Persian Wars support Thomas' position and call into question that of Loraux. Aeschylus and, very likely, Phrynichus, enjoyed great success with their plays narrating the victory at Salamis; similarly, Timotheus won a long-awaited victory at Athens with his *Persians*, which included Salamis but excluded Marathon. As we shall see, the poetic record does not support the "systemic occultation" of Salamis as seen by Loraux.[30]

---

[27] Loraux 1986, 161.

[28] For Aristophanes' presentation of Marathon and Salamis, see page 8 and n.17.

[29] Rosalind Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 221-5.

[30] Loraux 1986, 161.

As we will see, these themes can be traced through the poetic record, from their earliest appearance in Aeschylus to Timotheus, the last poet for whom we have evidence. Simonides, who wrote his lengthy elegy on Plataea for a panhellenic if not Spartan audience, understandably did not share this Athenian bias and consequently his poetry provides a valuable check on the Athenian presentation of the Wars.

"MYTH" VS. "HISTORY"

Poetry was instrumental in commemorating events of the far distant past and the more recent past. A strict division of the past into "myth" and "history" is illusory and the creation of modern minds. The ancient mind saw a continuum from the far distant past to the present. Those events from the far distant past which we commonly term "myth," such as Paris' abduction of Helen and Jason's quest for the golden fleece, were viewed as actual events, akin to what we term "history." Herodotus, for example, prefaced his history of the Persian Wars with a catalogue of minor hostilities between the East and the West, starting with the abductions of Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen (1.1-5). While he did not accept the role of the gods or heroes in the abductions—blaming instead mortal men and the loose character of the women—he clearly accepted as fact the women's existence, certain elements of their stories, and their role in Greek history: according to Herodotus' Persian sources, which he seemingly accepted as valid, the Persian Wars were the culmination of those hostilities between the Greek world and the East that began with the abduction of Io. Furthermore, that the Trojan War was viewed as a real event is indicated by Herodotus' account of Helen's stay in Egypt, which he says the Egyptian priests learned from Menelaus himself (2.113-20).

Nevertheless, the available evidence suggests that the Greeks did view the far distant past and the recent past largely as two different worlds. We find evidence for this in Hesiod's myth of the five ages (*WD* 106-201): in this version, presented as an alternate (ἕτερος λόγος) to the preceding story of Prometheus and Pandora, Hesiod recognizes a continuum from race to race, with each new race being formed only on the destruction of the preceding one and with members of preceding races often becoming semi-divine overseers of subsequent races. Hesiod does, however, see each race as separate and distinct from those which precede and follow it: each race was formed from a different metal; the second and subsequent ones were formed only after the destruction of the previous race; and each race differed from the others in lifestyle, morals, types of death, and fates after death. Hesiod thus sees his own race, the final, iron, race (*WD* 176), as distinct from the preceding races, including the race of the heroes, whose lives are the subject of much of Greek poetry.

Further evidence for a recognized gulf between contemporary events and the events of the far distant past is the perceived physical difference between contemporary men and the heroes: Cimon of Athens repatriated the bones of Theseus (Plut. *Thes*. 36.1-4), while the Spartans did the same for the bones of Orestes (Hdt. 1.67-8); Cimon and the Spartans were both able to recognize the unidentified human remains they discovered as those of the heroes whom they sought by the bones' enormous size in comparison to those of contemporary men (Plut. *Thes*. 36.2; Hdt. 1.68.3). These anecdotes suggest that Herodotus and Plutarch too believed that the worlds of contemporary men and heroes were separate and distinct.

As Edith Hall points out, the distinguishing factor between the two worlds "was not...a question of historical *veracity* [Hall's emphasis], but of recentness, concreteness, autopsy, and, hitherto, appropriateness for artistic representation."[31] In support of an ancient distinction between myth and recent history, she notes that Greek epic and most tragedy confined themselves to the deeds of the gods and heroes.[32] She argues that they would not have done so had there not been a line, however faintly drawn, between the two worlds. For ease of reference, I will use "myth" to signify the events of far distant past, where the race of heroes dominated, and "history" for the more recent past, dominated by regular mortals.

Despite the line drawn between the worlds of myth and history, there was no hard and fast rule against the recording of contemporary deeds in art, either literary or plastic. The Homeric epics imply an acceptance of the recording of the great deeds of one's contemporaries. Although Homer sang of men from a different era, he and his audience did not object to the idea of people recording contemporary deeds: Odysseus interrupts the song of Demodocus as the bard sings of Odysseus' quarrel with Achilles (*Od.* 8.75); Helen weaves a tapestry depicting various scenes from the Trojan War even as she awaits the outcome of that war (*Il.* 3.126-8). Furthermore, we have evidence for the acceptance of the narration of current events not only reflected in epic, but also existing concretely in epinicia—poems composed for the sole purpose of commemorating athletic victories. Although certainly the bulk of an epinician focused on deeds from the world of myth, the victor's name and achievement were present in every ode and there could be no question in the minds of the audience that they were hearing a song celebrating the recent deeds of a friend or family member.[33] It should not be surprising, therefore, that we find the historical topic of the Persian Wars not only alluded to briefly in poetry but narrated at length in such genres as elegy, tragedy, comedy, and epic.

---

[31] Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-definition in Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 66; see also Desmond Conacher, *Aeschylus: The Earlier Plays and Related Studies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 5 n.4.

It is possible to argue that the criterion for determining the suitability of events to poetry was the nature of the audience: poems celebrating the private deeds of one's contemporaries were restricted to a private audience (e.g., the archaic lyrics of Sappho and Archilochus, or the epinicia of Pindar and Bacchylides); poems celebrating the deeds of the mythic past were appropriate for both public and private affairs (e.g., tragedies and Homeric epic). Epinicia were originally sung in private symposia, before a select audience of friends and family; similarly Demodocus' song, that of a hired singer at a banquet hosted by a King for a chosen few, may reflect private rather than public commemoration, in which the deeds of the great princes, who were admittedly not known to the King and his companions, provided private entertainment for an elite group rather than officially-sanctioned entertainment for the city as a whole. Presumably Helen's tapestry was also for personal use within the palace rather than for public consumption. Nevertheless, poetry celebrating the group achievements of the Persian Wars was intended for public performance.[34] Perhaps the community as a whole did not care to hear

---

[32] Hall 1989, 66; see also Edith Hall, ed., *Aeschylus: Persians* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996), 9-10.

[33] Our knowledge of epinicia is drawn primarily from Pindar's odes, in which the illustrative myth dominated. The less-extensive remains of Bacchylides' epinicia suggest that he devoted more space to the *laudandus* and his victory than did Pindar. The anecdote that Simonides was instructed to get part of his fee from the Dioscuri, to whom he devoted the larger part of an epinician (Cicero, *de. orat.* 2.86), implies that Simonides, like Pindar, spent more time on the myth than on the *laudandus*.

[34] The widespread knowledge of Pindar presupposes that the poems, although originally sung for a private audience, were re-performed in other, more public, situations.

publicly of an individual's triumphs, although they were willing to hear of those of their community.

Despite the recognition of a divide between the immediate past and the far distant past, and despite the predominance of mythic events in most forms of literature, it was possible and acceptable to narrate the significant achievements of one's contemporaries in poetry. During the Persian Wars, in their immediate aftermath, and for decades afterwards, lengthy poems explicitly narrating and commemorating these events were composed for public, communal, consumption in a variety of genres.

THE VALUE OF POETRY AS EVIDENCE

Poetry was an important medium in ancient Greek society and provides a wealth of knowledge about the culture in which it was created. Poetry did not simply entertain, but also served to confirm, codify, and even challenge a culture's *mores*. It reached all segments of society through public performance at celebrations and competitions, and through more private affairs such as symposia. Popular songs and those performed publicly would reach the population as a whole.[35]

Poetry provides significant evidence for the views and the attitudes of the Greeks. We must not, however, ignore G. Zuntz' warning against "false ingenuity" with its tendency towards "picking out...isolated words or phrases and relating them to [historical] facts (often imaginary) outside the poet's creation."[36] Nevertheless, we need not throw the baby out with the bathwater. All literature, whether imaginative or realistic, is grounded in the culture of the author who creates it and must therefore reflect that culture and author, as well as the target audience.[37] Although an author has great latitude in composing his work, deciding on issues of character and plot, themes and motifs, he is nonetheless constrained by what Sourvinou-Inwood terms "perceptual filters."[38] Moreover, since much of Greek literature was composed for public performance, and often for a competitive setting, the author is also constrained by the perceptual filters of his audience. Among these are the shared language, culture, and general knowledge of author and audience, as well as their intertextual knowledge (that is "the knowledge and experience which [the] reading of other texts has deposited in [the] mind").[39] These filters, together with the author's manipulation of them, combine to shape the poetry and the audience's reaction to it.

---

[35] Aristophanes and Pherecrates could quote and parody various poets: *Frogs* was premised on the familiarity of the audience with the plays of Aeschylus and Euripides; Pherecrates' *Cheiron* implies knowledge of the new brand of poets (see pages 216-219). This suggests that a certain segment of their audience would have been familiar with the more popular poets.

[36] G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1955), ix. As A.M.

As Sourvinou-Inwood notes, it is possible for us to determine an audience's reception of a particular text by reconstructing the perceptual filters of that audience. This

---

Bowie has indicated, Zuntz' admonition should not be taken to extremes; there are readily identifiable political references in tragedies which repay examination ("Tragic Filters for History: Euripides' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*," in *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed., Christopher Pelling [Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 39).

[37] Aristophanes' *Birds* and Lucian's *True History*, two early examples of speculative literature, create new worlds clearly modeled on the worlds of the respective authors: Cloud-cuckooland, founded midway between the Earth and the Heavens, has all the trappings of Athens at the time of the Empire; Lucian's Moonmen and Sunmen battle with equipment and practices clearly modeled on those of his contemporaries. Realistic literature, such as the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides and the tragedies of Aeschylus, do not create new worlds, but the descriptions of foreign cities and cultures are nevertheless coloured by the author's own expectations and preconceptions. François Hartog provides a study of the effects of such ethnic stereotyping, demonstrating the role of the Other in defining the Self (*Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, trans. Janet Lloyd [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988]).

[38] "Perceptual filters" are the baggage an author or audience brings to the creation or reception of literature and which help the author or audience make sense of what is presented (Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, *Reading Greek Death* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1995], 1-9).

[39] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 3. Sourvinou-Inwood's observations are, of course, equally applicable to those who experience a text aurally.

can be done through the analysis of the circumstances of production of the poem, its historical and cultural context, and the actual text.[40] This analysis allows us to access the general and intertextual knowledge of the poet and his audience, as well as their "horizon of expectations" or "the set of cultural, ethical and literary (generic, stylistic, thematic) expectations of the work's readers in the historical moment of its appearance."[41] An examination of the poems celebrating the Persian Wars, and of what the authors included and excluded, with the expectation of being understood and appreciated by their audiences, can determine what their audience as a whole knew about the Persian Wars and how they viewed those events.

One caveat is that the Athenian audience, the target of much of the poetry of the Persian Wars, was not homogeneous and so its members could not be expected to share completely what they were thinking about with everyone else.[42] Just as two individuals can respond differently to the same lecture, movie, or sporting event, based on their own personal character, sympathies, and psychological make-up, so too can two members of an audience have differing reactions to the same performance. Nevertheless, it is possible to "infer what an author expected to be sayable and performable without alienating an audience (though even here different occasions and genres can impose different norms and allow different licenses)."[43]

---

[40] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 4.

[41] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 7 n.27, quoting S. R. Suleiman, "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, eds., S. R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 35. Sourvinou-Inwood neglects to note that Suleiman is herself quoting Hans-Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," *New Literary History* 2 (1970): 14. Suleiman expands on Jauss' theory, noting that there is no such thing as a single homogenous reading public and that we must therefore expect multiple horizons of expectations within any audience.

[42] Suleiman 1970, 37-8.

[43] Christopher Pelling, *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian* (London: Routledge, 2000), 246.

Some interesting work has been done on the tragic genre, reading tragedies as evidence for the culture in which they were created and performed. Tragedy was a very public and community-oriented genre: the plays were performed at civic festivals; citizens formed the audience and the chorus; officials chosen by the state selected the plays to be performed; the state underwrote the cost of the production through the institution of the *choregos*; the victor's prize was awarded by judges chosen from the citizens; and free admission removed any financial barriers that would prevent attendance. Analysis of tragedies as public texts has shown that tragedy works to challenge and confirm Athenian customs, institutions, identity, and history. Furthermore, as public poetry performed before an audience comprised primarily of Athenian citizens—albeit citizens of varying ages and social classes—tragedy can show us what issues various sections of Athenian society were thinking about and how they conceptualized those issues.[44]

Since the poems of Simonides, Pindar, Choerilus, and Timotheus on the Persian Wars were also composed for public performance—and often in competitive venues—we can apply to them the results of the studies of tragedy to infer the popular views of the Persian Wars. Unlike poets writing private texts for symposia, to be performed by and for members of the aristocratic class, poets writing public texts, in order to be successful, had to appeal to most and refrain from offending many. Applying this theory to public texts on the Persian Wars will tell us how the audience conceived of the Wars: what was and what was not acceptable; what was and what was not honourable, noteworthy, and praiseworthy; and whether or not those views changed over time or between communities. Furthermore, analysis of the same subject matter in poems of different genres will allow us to determine what was and what was not acceptable in various genres and how the genres reacted to accommodate the recording of events from recent history. Since the poets are themselves products of their historical and cultural environment, what they had to say about the Persian Wars can tell us what they thought was acceptable to their societies as a whole; the popularity of the poems can perhaps help us to infer whether the poets were correct in their assessments.

---

[44] See in general Christopher Pelling, ed., *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), and

In addition to examining how the poets approached the Persian Wars, I will plot the differences in the presentation of events made by the constraints of the particular genres. "Genre" refers to a distinct style of literature, determined by its place and manner of performance as well as by communally recognized criteria of form and content.[45] Although formal discussions of genres were the province of philosophers, grammarians, and theorists, poets and their public did recognize the existence of genres and responded accordingly.[46] There were guidelines for the composition of pieces that were, if not explicitly stated, tacitly accepted and adhered to by the poets.[47] We see not only uniformity among poems, allowing us to identify one as an example of the tragic genre, another as epinician, but we also see the negative reactions among the critics and

---

in particular P. E. Easterling, "Constructing the Heroic," 21-38 and Pelling, "Conclusion," 213-35.

[45] Ian Rutherford, ed., *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 4-5.

[46] E.g., Aristotle discusses discrete and recognizable poetic categories (*Poetics* 1447a-1448b). That the Alexandrian grammarians could compile their lists of the best poets in various styles (οἱ ἐγκριθέντες) is clear evidence that there were recognizable and commonly accepted characteristics governing the different genres.

[47] For example, although both Aeschylus' *Persae* and Aristophanes' *Acharnians* are dramas with a martial theme, we can recognize significant differences between the two plays that allow us to regard the *Persae* as tragedy and the *Acharnians* as comedy. Among other criteria, the *Persae*, like most early tragedies, ends on a note of *pathos*, while the *Acharnians* ends on the positive note typical of comedy. That the Athenians too recognized a difference between the plays is evinced by their not pitting the two against each other in competition.

philosophers when poets disregarded the conventions governing their poetic genres (e.g., Plato, *Laws* 700-701a; [Plut.] *de musica*). Genre not only helps an author shape his treatment of a topic, but also helps the audience to shape their understanding of the material presented to them and the author's approach to the subject.[48] An examination of the theme of the Persian Wars in various genres that traditionally were interested in other kinds of things becomes essentially an examination of genre development and extension.

THE NATURE OF THE COMMEMORATIVE POEMS

With one notable exception (*PMG* 531, Simonides' lyric poem for the fallen of Thermopylae), the poems treating the Persian Wars take victories as their subject. These victories were, however, won at the expense of the lives of many citizens. Their deaths can affect the poets' approach to their topic. Those poems performed shortly after the events they narrate combine commemoration of the victory and encomia of the combatants with lamentation for those who have died and consolation of their survivors. Those poems performed at later dates focused less on lamentation and consolation in favour of commemoration. The passage of time helps to dissipate the sorrow felt by the bereaved and hence the need for the poets to lament the fallen and console the bereaved; commemorative discourse then turns itself to praising the events in question.[49] Since the poems on the Persian Wars were written for an audience with a vested interest in the events and their presentation, we can expect the initial poetic histories to have elements of lamentation and consolation, and ultimately encomia, not only of those who died, but also of the society that bore them. Less emotionally charged narration of the events begins to move to the forefront only after time has healed the wounds caused to individuals and city-states by the deaths of the combatants.

---

[48] For a more detailed discussion of genre and its effects on poets and audiences, see Glenn W. Most, "Generating Genres: the Idea of the Tragic," in *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, eds. Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000), 17-18.

[49] As I finished my dissertation at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, I experienced first-hand the shift from consolation to praise in both the official and popular reactions. In the space of a few weeks, the national sorrow felt for the victims of the attacks turned to praise of those who had helped in the rescue efforts.

Support for a hierarchy of consolation, lamentation, and encomium can be found in Menander Rhetor's third century AD treatise on the art of rhetoric which sets out the rules for composing various types of speeches.[50] In his discussion of funeral orations (418.5-422.4) he notes the varying degrees of consolation, lamentation, and praise to be found in *epitaphioi*. He states

> νῦν δὲ χρόνος πολὺς παρεληλυθὼς οὐκέτι δίδωσι χώραν οὔτε θρήνοις οὔτε παραμυθίαις· λήθη τε γὰρ ἐγγέγονε τῷ χρόνῳ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ ὃν παραμυθησόμεθα οὐκ ἔχομεν· οὔτε γὰρ πατέρες ἐκείνων οὔτε τὸ γένος γνώριμον. ἄτοπον δὲ ὅλως εἰ καὶ γνώριμον τυγχάνοι, καὶ προσέτι ἄκαιρον τὸ μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον ἐγείρειν εἰς θρῆνον ἐθέλειν κεκοιμισμένης ἤδη τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς λύπης
> The long passage of time no longer provides occasion for lamentations or consolations; for forgetfulness of sorrow has come with time and we have no one to comfort; for neither their fathers nor their kin are known. And even if the family were known, it would be absurd and quite out of place to aim to rouse them to lamentation at this distance of time, when their grief has long been assuaged (418.25).

Menander Rhetor is, of course, writing about funeral orations and not about poems treating historical subjects, still less poems specifically treating the Persian Wars. Nevertheless, we can perhaps apply his precepts on funeral orations to the poems under consideration: both funeral orations and the poems on the Persian Wars are public discourse, designed to be delivered before an audience with a vested interest in the events; both were reactions to war; and finally, both are intended to commemorate wars, honouring those who fought—and died— in them, or the victory which they won, or both.

Of course, the funeral oration is restricted to Athens. Nevertheless, other city-states can likely be expected to want to praise their own dead and their deeds according to their own customs. We can, therefore, apply what Menander Rhetor says about the nature of Athenian funeral orations to Greek public encomiastic speech, namely, that lamentation tends to be concentrated in the early days, becoming less prominent as time passes. We can also expand his observation to take into account the audience: those poems composed for performance at funerals differ from those poems composed for other venues. In addition to the temporal distance suggested by Menander Rhetor, we can perhaps see a spatial distance, determined by the performance venue that affects the poet's approach to the Wars. As we will see, one sharp distinction between those poems written shortly after the events they commemorate or composed for official commemorative occasions and those written several years later or for other occasions, is the level of consolation and lamentation. Those of Simonides have a greater emphasis on consolation and lamentation in contrast to the encomia of the Wars found in Aeschylus, Choerilus, and Timotheus. Many of Simonides' odes were composed for memorial situations; those of Aeschylus, Choerilus, and Timotheus were not.

REVIEW OF SCHOLARSHIP

Simonides wrote in a variety of poetic forms and inconveniently, although understandably, the surviving fragments are scattered over a variety of editions, classified

---

[50] I am grateful to my colleague, David Lamari (University of Western Ontario), for bringing this passage

according to genre. D. L. Page's *Epigrammata Graeca* contains the epigrams, with discussion in his *Further Greek Epigrams* (*FGE*). Page's *Poetae Melici Graeci* (*PMG*) contains the lyric poems while M. L. West's *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (*IEG*) contains the elegiac poems; the second edition of *IEG* also includes the newly-discovered poem on Plataea.[51]

The recent discovery of the New Simonides containing fragments of Simonides' poem on Plataea (frr. 10-17 *IEG*^{2}) sparked a renewed interest in Simonides and in elegy in general. Extensive work has been done on the structure of the poem, and the place and circumstances of its performance. Prior to the discovery of the New Simonides, E.L. Bowie had argued convincingly for the existence of lengthy narrative elegies on events of contemporary and near-contemporary history that were to be performed in a public setting.[52] Bowie argues that the length of the poems renders them inappropriate to the symposium or the *komos*, the site of much elegiac poetry. At the symposium, each guest was expected to take a turn in the singing. The excessive length of these elegies prevents the participation of the other guests by forcing them to wait for quite some time for their turn to sing. Bowie further argues that the transmitted titles of the elegies and testimonia about their content point to historical rather than mythological themes. Simonides' elegy is strong evidence in support of Bowie's theory and suggests the need for a re-

---

to my attention, and for subsequent discussions on this topic.

[51] D. L. Page, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975); D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962); M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci, editio altera*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).

[52] E. L. Bowie, "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival," *JHS* 106 (1986): 13-35.

examination of the role of poetry in general and elegy in particular in the recording of past events.[53]

Simonides' poems for the Spartans also provide evidence for the Spartan perception of the Persian Wars and their role therein. As such, they provide a welcome balance to the predominantly Athenian view of the Wars found in the other sources. Simonides' poem honouring the fallen of Thermopylae adumbrates key Spartan values and ideology in the midst of a disastrous defeat, while his poem on Plataea provides a view of a victory.

Phrynichus stands early in the development of Greek tragedy and so it is unfortunate that we have very little evidence with which to assess his contribution to the history of tragedy or his literary merits. The fragmentary preservation of his plays has, understandably, hampered scholarship.[54] Consideration of the *Phoenissae* is generally restricted to studies of Aeschylus' *Persae* and the literary dependence of the two plays.[55] Detailed study has been largely restricted to his *Sack of Miletus*, primarily addressing the questions of the date of the performance and the reasons for its disastrous reception. Upon seeing the play the Athenians wept, fined the poet 1000 drachmas, and banned future performance of the play. The traditional date of the performance, ca. 493 and so shortly after the fall of Miletus, has been challenged by Ernst Badian and Joseph

---

[53] For discussion of Bowie's theory concerning narrative elegy and its relevance to Simonides, see pages 43-49.

[54] For the fragments of Phrynichus, see Bruno Snell, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 1, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

[55] One exception to this generalization is Anton E. Raubitschek. He asserts that the *Phoenissae* was the source for Herodotus' account of the abduction of Io in the first book of the *Histories* and that this might point to the play's content ("The Phoinissai of Phrynichos," *Tyche* 8 [1993]: 143-4). Unfortunately, Raubitschek offers no evidence, just very tenuous assumptions about Herodotus' reliance on poetic accounts and the interest of the Phoenicians in Io.

Roisman who argue, independently, for a performance date ca. 479.[56] The evidence does not, however, support their theory and the traditional date should be upheld: Phrynichus' play was performed shortly after the events they described; we can, therefore, point to it as the first play on an explicitly historical topic.[57]

Aeschylus and his *Persae* have received their full meed of study and praise, both as poetry and as evidence for the Wars.[58] H. D. Broadhead's commentary on the *Persae* is comprehensive and remains the standard English work on the play. It is, however, somewhat dated and flawed by the phenomenon known as Orientalism.[59] This term was coined by Edward Saïd in his seminal study, *Orientalism*; in it, he examined the representation of the East in Western literature as a culturally and politically charged manifestation created by Western authors and designed to reinforce the West's cultural superiority and privileged position.[60] Saïd shows how the image of the East as found in Western literature so far from being an accurate portrayal of the East is rather a reflection of the West's idea of the East; he further demonstrates how the West created the East as its own polar opposite, endowing the East with vices corresponding to the West's virtues.[61]

---

[56] Ernst Badian, "Archons and Strategoi," *Antichthon* 5 (1971): 1-34 and "Phrynichus and Athens' οἰκήια κακά," *SCI* 15 (1990): 55-60; Joseph Roisman, "On Phrynichos' *Sack of Miletos* and *Phoenissai*," *Eranos* 86 (1988): 15-23.

[57] For the date of the *Sack of Miletus* and reasons for rejecting Badian's and Roisman's attempts at re-dating it, see pages 105-110.

[58] I will follow West's text of the *Persae* (ed., *Aeschylus: Tragoedia* [Stuttgart, Teubner, 1990).

[59] H.D. Broadhead, ed., *The Persae of Aeschylus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

[60] Helen Sancisi-Weerdenburg provides a useful balance to the Orientalizing trend in Greek literature by examining Persian inscriptions and iconography which present very different images of Darius and Xerxes from those found in the Greek sources ("The Persian Kings and History," in *Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, ed., Christina Shuttleworth Kraus [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999], 91-112). One can, of course, recognize a certain bias on the part of the Persian artists: whereas Greek artists and authors tend to demonize the Persians, Persian artists and authors present, in the public sphere, an idealized picture of their rulers.

Saïd found the first example of Orientalism in Aeschylus' *Persae*; in it, he sees the East "transformed from a very far distant and often threatening Otherness into figures that are relatively familiar (in Aeschylus' case, grieving Asiatic women [*sic*; the Chorus is grieving Asiatic men])" which "obscures the fact that the audience is watching a highly artificial enactment of what a non-Oriental has made into a symbol for the whole Orient."[62] The result of this is that the Athenian playwright presented a largely Athenian audience with an Athenian conception of the Persians, rather than an accurate and unbiased portrayal of the Persians.

A lack of critical awareness concerning the phenomenon of Orientalism mars Broadhead's commentary. He asserts, for example, that "since the scene is set in the heart of Persia and since the characters are all Persians, the dramatist was bound to present as faithfully as he could the Persian point of view."[63] This assumes a detailed knowledge of Persian customs on the part of Aeschylus and his audience that is somewhat unlikely. Furthermore, it fails to take into account the fact that Aeschylus may have had artistic and dramatic reasons for his presentation of the Persians and their customs. Recognition of this phenomenon and its manifestation in Greek literature allows us to read not only the *Persae* but all Greek accounts of the Persian Wars as evidence for the Greek—and, given the performance venue of the poems, usually Athenian—conception of the Persian Wars,

---

[61] Edward Saïd, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1978); references are to the pagination of the second edition (1994).

[62] Saïd 1994, 21.

[63] Broadhead 1960, xx.

Persian culture, and the Persians, as well as evidence for the Greek conception of themselves.

Saïd's work on Orientalism has had an effect on the approach of later generations of Classicists to their analysis of images of the East as found in ancient Greek cultures. In *Inventing the Barbarian*, Edith Hall explores how Orientalism manifested itself in tragedy, including its effect on Aeschylus' *Persae*. She follows up on her work on the Athenian conception of the Barbarian in tragedy with her commentary on the *Persae*; shaped by her understanding of Orientalism, it focuses on the primarily social and literary aspects of the play and complements the work of Broadhead.[64] Hall is especially useful on the creation of the Barbarian in the *Persae* and the significance of Aeschylus' creation to later presentations of the Persians. Hall argues "Greek writing about barbarians is usually an exercise in self-definition, for the barbarian is often portrayed as the opposite of the ideal Greek."[65] The barbarian, most often represented by a Persian, appears as slavish, hierarchical, and effeminate as well as both cowardly and cruel; as such he stands in contrast to the free, brave, democratic, and masculine Greek. By putting the stereotypical barbarian on-stage, discussing and describing stereotypical Greek characters, the difference between the two cultures is readily apparent, with the Greek culture emerging as superior. By seeing the two side-by-side, the Athenian audience would passively absorb which characteristics were to be praised as Greek and which were to be despised as "barbarian."

Hall argues that the Barbarian as anti-Greek is not found in literature prior to tragedy. Although the *Iliad* was the first literary account of the clash between East and

---

[64] Hall 1996.

West, the East-West antithesis is absent.[66] The non-Greek characters in Homeric epic, such as Hector, the best of the Trojans, and Priam, their noble King, were viewed as positive characters, endowed with courage and honour equal to that of the Greeks. Instead, Hall grounds the emergence of the Barbarian in Aeschylus' *Persae*, a play written in the aftermath of successful panhellenic military action against the Persian Empire, the first time the mainland Greeks were in conflict with the Persians. Aeschylus' portrayal of the Persians—from the slavish behaviour of Persian councilors who prostrate themselves before their rulers, to the cruelty of a Queen concerned more with her son's appearance than the annihilation of the entire Persian force, to Xerxes himself with his womanish weeping, wailing, and rending of clothes at his defeat—gave shape to the character of barbarians found in later plays (e.g., the title character in Euripides' *Medea* or the cowardly Phrygian slave in Euripides' *Orestes*).[67] In the *Persae*, Hall sees an "absolute polarization in Greek thought of Hellene and barbarian" that "emerged at some point in response to the increasing threat posed to the Greek-speaking world by the immense Persian empire."[68] As we will see, the creation of the barbarian in early tragedy informed not only subsequent tragedies but also the later poetic texts of Timotheus and, perhaps, Choerilus, as well as the speeches of the Athenian orators. In this way, poetry helped to shape Athenian reaction to the Wars.

---

[65] Hall 1989, 1.

[66] Herodotus considered the Trojan War to be the first clash between the East and the West. He identifies the abduction of Helen and the capture of Troy as the cause of the enmity between the East and the West (1.4.4-5.1); he then makes Xerxes visit Troy prior to his crossing over into the Greek mainland, implicitly linking the Trojan War with the Persian Wars (7.43.1).

[67] Although Medea functions as a tragic hero, her barbarian nature is still apparent in her unwomanly determination and demands for vengeance, her skill with drugs and poisons, and subsequent murder of her own children.

[68] Hall 1989, 57.

Against the Athenian hostility implicit in their creation of the Barbarian as a culture diametrically opposed to and inferior to Athenian culture, we must set Margaret C. Miller's study of the Athenian reception of *Perserie* (the acceptance and imitation of Persian motifs, styles, and artifacts).[69] Miller examines the archaeological, epigraphical, iconographical, and literary evidence, concludes that Athens' anti-Persian rhetoric was at odds with Athens' willingness to adopt *Perserie*, and argues that the contradiction between Athenian words and deeds with respect to the Persians was ideological.

Although remaining hostile to the Persians and proud of their own accomplishments against the Persians in battle, the Athenians were willing to appropriate, with minor changes, Persian customs in such areas as pottery styles and clothing. One effect of this appropriation was to turn *Perserie* into a weapon against the Persians: e.g., the Athenians adopted the Persian *kandys*, a long-sleeved outer garment worn by Persian men, and transformed it into a women's and children's garment, thus essentially undercutting the masculinity of Persian men who were now seen to be dressed in women's clothing.[70] The adoption of Persian styles and motifs then becomes a means to further articulate the differences between Athenians and Persians.

The other poetic accounts of the Wars have not been as fortunate as those of Simonides and Aeschylus. Choerilus has enjoyed some prominence in Callimachean studies as a possible source of some of the allusions in the proem to the *Aetia*.[71] His *Persica*, however, has seen little independent research into its literary merits as an account of the Persian Wars or into its contribution to historiography and the commemoration of the Wars. A. F. Naeke's edition, while informative, does not attempt to examine Choerilus in light of other poetic accounts of the Wars; P. Radici Colace restricts his study of the *Persica* to a few pages in his commentary on the poet and adds little to Naeke's discussion.[72] Colace does, however, include the texts and brief discussion of several papyrus fragments tentatively thought to be from Choerilus' *Persica* and which were unknown to Naeke. The *Persica* is indispensable to a study of the history of the treatment of the Persian Wars as well as to the history of epic itself and is deserving of detailed study.

---

[69] Margaret C. Miller *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.: a Study in Cultural Receptivity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Miller coins the term *Perserie* on analogy with Chinoiserie (1).

[70] Miller 1997, 165-70; 248-50.

[71] For the relationship of Callimachus' *Aetia* and Choerilus' *Persica*, see pages 185-192.

Timotheus and his *Persians* had also seen little exegesis; this is beginning to change. In 1904 a substantial portion of the *Persians*, a previously lost text by the celebrated yet virtually lost poet, was discovered. The initial interest sparked by this discovery quickly faded in the face of ringing denunciations of Timotheus' style, diction, and imagery.[73] Consequently, most of the work done on Timotheus had centred on the mechanics of establishing the text and its colometry while Timotheus himself figures largely as a footnote in general studies of literature.[74] Timotheus was the most famed practitioner of the phenomenon known as the New Music, a style that flourished during the mid- to late- fifth century.[75] As such, he fares better, marginally, in studies of music and the ethical repercussions of the New Music.[76]

---

[72] A. F. Naeke, *Choerili Samii quae supersunt* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1817); P. Radici Colace, *Choerili Samii Reliquae* (Rome: L'Erma, 1979). The text of Choerilus can also be found in the standard collections of epic fragments: G. Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* I (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877); A. Bernabé, *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta* I (Leipzig: Teubner, 1987), which has superseded Kinkel's text. M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988) omits the text of Choerilus, referring readers instead to the editions of Colace and Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983).

[73] F. Kenyon neatly encapsulated the initial scholarly assessment of Timotheus: "So crabbed that even in his own language he must be rather spelled out than read; so forced, contorted, and exaggerated that he is simply not translatable into any other language; so devoid of beauty of idea, of phrase, or of rhythm that it is only by remembering that his verses are but the libretto to a musical composition that we can understand his being tolerated at all" ("Greek Papyri and Classical Literature," *JHS* 39 [1919]: 5). His view has largely prevailed, although Timotheus is now beginning to enjoy serious and favourable study.

[74] The text of the *Persians* was transmitted as prose. In the *editio princeps*, Wilamowitz established a preliminary colometry in 253 lines (ed., *Timotheus. Die Perser* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'che, 1903a]; D. L. Page later modified the text and line division to 240 lines [=*PMG* 791]). I will follow Page's text.

Prior to 2002, the only substantial work on the poetry of Timotheus was T.H. Janssen's largely unsatisfactory commentary on the *Persians*.[77] Janssen claims to focus on Timotheus' language and style, but ignores both the effects of the New Music on Timotheus' presentation of the battle of Salamis and the effects of Orientalism on his depiction of the Persians.[78] Furthermore, with the exception of Aeschylus' *Persae*, Janssen overlooks earlier poems on the Persian Wars and their possible influence on Timotheus. Finally, with the exception of the question of the date and place of first performance of the poem, his commentary is marred by the absence of any discussion of the poem's literary merits and predecessors, as well as any discussion of its social and historical context.

The situation has improved considerably with the recent publication of J.H. Hordern's commentary.[79] Hordern conveniently prints all of the fragments of Timotheus' poetry, including the recently published fragment from Philodemus (1.89 *On Poems*

---

[75] The New Music is characterized by its astrophic and polymetric nature, as well as by its highly visually and musically mimetic element, and its subordination of the text to the music.

[76] Warren D. Anderson, *Ethos and Education in Greek Music: the Evidence of Poetry and Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968) discusses Timotheus' contribution to music and, ultimately, condemns it on ethical grounds. West offers the fullest discussion of Timotheus and the New Music (1992, 357-72). Thomas J. Mathiesen's discussion is comprehensive but based on an often uncritical reading of the sources (*Apollo's Lyre: Greek Music and Musical Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* [Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1999], 58-71). Landels (1999) provides only a passing mention.

[77] T. H. Janssen, *Timotheus, Persae: a Commentary* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1989). Janssen uses Wilamowitz' text rather than Page's, but provides a useful chart comparing the line numbers.

[78] Janssen 1989, vii.

[=804a Hordern]), and offers sound philological, textual, and metrical exegesis of the fragments. He provides a general introduction to Timotheus, as well as to the New Music, dithyramb, and *nomos*. His commentary provides an excellent basis for further study of Timotheus and his poetry. Further work includes an examination of Timotheus in the context of other poems treating the Persian Wars. Hordern offers good discussion of Timotheus' debt to Aeschylus, but makes little mention of Timotheus' or Aeschylus' places within the tradition of the Persian Wars.

SUMMARY

The fairly substantial corpus of poetry devoted to the Persian Wars has been largely ignored, both for its literary merit and for its contribution to the popular perception of the Persians and the Wars. Analysis of the poems tended to be done in a literary vacuum without reference to other poetic texts on the same topic and without consideration of the poem's place within its genre and within the development of historical and commemorative poetry.

From Homeric epic to lyric epinicia, poetry was the vehicle for the commemoration of great deeds. The dominance of myth in poetry has suggested that poetry was deemed to be unsuitable to the commemoration of recent, historical, events. As we will see, the notion of a strict division between myth and history and the suitability of each to poetry or prose is illusory. Poetry was capable of treating historical events and did so readily, especially in the case of the Persian Wars. The poetic texts provide

---

[79] J.H. Hordern, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Hordern had published a few preliminary comments in "Some Observations on the *Persae* of Timotheus (*PMG* 791)," *CQ* 49 (1999): 433-8.

significant insights into how these Wars were viewed by the Greek participants and how knowledge of the Wars was perpetuated.

I will examine the poetry by genre, essentially chronologically by poet. In each chapter, I will examine the historical and literary context of the poem, the presentation of the Wars, and the date and place of the first performance of the poem. In this way, I will attempt to determine how the various poets presented the Wars and how their presentation of the Wars contributed to the preservation of the tradition of the Persian Wars. I will also consider the effect of the genre on the poets' presentation of the wars. In this way, I can attempt to plot the poetic tradition of the Persian Wars.

CHAPTER 1: LYRIC AND ELEGY (SIMONIDES AND PINDAR)

The earliest poetic accounts of the Persian Wars appear in lyric and elegiac format. Simonides of Ceos (ca. 556-468) is one of the first poets known to have written on the Persian Wars. He wrote in a variety of styles, composing epitaphs and epigrams as well as lengthy lyric and elegiac poems. A number of his poems narrating the various battles of the Wars were performed shortly after those battles. As implied by Menander Rhetor's analysis of funeral orations, the nearness to the events of Simonides and his audience affected Simonides' approach to the topic (418.25).[1] Unlike Aeschylus' *Persae* and Timotheus' *Persians*, which were performed years after the Wars, before audiences who were not composed of the recently bereaved, and in venues in which lamentation was neither expected nor accepted, Simonides could not ignore Greek casualties and concentrate on Greek victories. Although Simonides' poems did contain praise of the victories, he could not ignore the sacrifice made by those who had won the victories: the dead needed their full meed of lamentation and their families and city their full meed of consolation, just as the victories themselves needed their full meed of praise. Several of his poems were performed before audiences of the recently bereaved—the families and fellow citizens of the victorious dead. Their presence meant that his poems needed to display an element of lamentation for the dead and consolation of the living not found in the later poets.[2] Simonides' approach to the Persian Wars was often to lament the dead and console the living as much as to celebrate the victory.

---

[1] For Menander Rhetor, see page 24.

[2] The absence of lamentation for Greek losses and consolation of Greek kin in Aeschylus' *Persae* is clear.

Another early poet was Pindar (ca. 518-438), who celebrated the Persian Wars both with lengthy narrative poetry and through allusions and brief mention in his epinicia. Pindar wrote a dithyramb for the Athenians, which most likely took the Athenian naval victories as its subject (frr. 76-7 Maehler). Unfortunately, only two short fragments survive. Nonetheless, the fragments do offer insights into Pindar's approach to the Persian Wars and the Athenian perception of them.

Since we have so much more evidence for Simonides' accounts of the Wars, I will first consider Pindar's dithyramb and then devote the bulk of this chapter to Simonides. The preserved texts suggest that, unlike the later poets, Simonides made little mention of the Persians and their role in the Wars; instead he preferred to narrate the Greeks' actions and their victories rather than the Persians' and their defeats. As we will see, the preserved fragments of Simonides suggest that he, and quite likely Pindar, made no contribution to the public view of the Persians as Other. In this chapter, I will examine Simonides' and Pindar's narrative poems devoted to the battles of the Persian Wars as they strove to praise the Greeks for their victories and absolve them of their defeats. I will first set out the evidence for the individual poems and consider the questions of the date and place of first performance, and issues of interpretation. I will then consider the questions of Simonides' approach to his material, his treatment of the theme of the Persian Wars, and his effect on other authors.

From the marked absence of any mention of Greek casualties in the surviving portion of Timotheus' *Persians*, we can infer both a similar absence in the lost section and an avoidance of lamentation and consolation throughout the poem. The late date of Choerilus' *Persica* (ca. 425-404) suggests that lamentation and consolation were not prominent in that poem. Despite the loss of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*, the tradition of strong similarities between it and Aeschylus' *Persae* suggests that it too focused on narrating the victory to the exclusion of any mention of Greek casualties or setbacks.

PINDAR FRR. 76-7 SNELL-MAEHLER

Ὦ ταὶ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι,
Ἑλλάδος ἔρει–
σμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι, δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον.
O brilliant and violet-crowned and celebrated in song, bulwark of Greece, famous Athens, divine city (fr. 76).

ὅθι παῖδες Ἀθαναίων ἐβάλοντο φαεννάν
κρηπίδ' ἐλευθερίας
where the sons of the Athenians laid the shining foundation of freedom (fr. 77)

The fragments appear separately in various sources.[3] Plutarch quotes them in such a way as to suggest that they are both from the same poem, by Pindar.[4] He quotes part of fr. 76, follows with fr. 77, and states that fr. 77 justifies the sentiments of fr. 76: Πίνδαρος ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος προσεῖπε τὰς Ἀθήνας, οὐχ ὅτι ταῖς Φρυνίχου τραγῳδίαις καὶ Θέσπιδος ὤρθουν τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἀλλ' ὅτι πρῶτον, ὥς φησιν αὐτός [fr. 77 follows], "Pindar said that Athens was the bulwark of Greece, not because Athens elevated Greece with the tragedies of Phrynichus and Thespis, but that, as he himself says, ['the sons of the Athenians laid the shining foundation of freedom']" (*de glor. Ath.* 7). That the "foundation of freedom" refers to Artemisium is confirmed by other sources who quote the fragment and identify the battle of Artemisium as the topic of the sentence.[5]

---

[3] M.J. van der Weiden, ed., *The Dithyrambs of Pindar* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1991), 206-7.

[4] L.A. Stella challenged Pindar's authorship, proposing instead that fr. 77 be assigned to Simonides' poem on Artemisium. Stella suggests that Plutarch, "con una delle sue non rare sviste," misascribed the fragment (L.A. Stella, "Studi Simonidei I. Per la cronologia di Simonide," *RFIC* n.s. 24 [1946], 21). The context in which Plutarch quotes the fragments, however, argues for accepting Pindar's authorship. Furthermore, other sources indicate that the Athenians liked the title Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα, "bulwark of Greece" and so rewarded Pindar, variously, with the title πρόξενος, "public guest," ten thousand drachmas, and a statue (Isocr. *Or.* 15, 166; Paus. 1.8.4; Aeschin. *Ep.* 4.2). While we cannot accept the truth of the rewards at face value, they do indicate that antiquity considered Pindar the author. Compare van der Weiden 1991, 209.

[5] E.g., Plut. *de sera num. vind.* 6, *Vit. Them.* 8.2, and *de Herod. malign.* 34.

Fr. 76 is an elaborate address to Athens and, although likely from a dithyramb, comparison of its address with similar addresses in Pindar's other styles of poetry (in particular, epicinia) suggest that it likely forms part of the opening proem. It can thus be read as programmatic for the poem as a whole. In the midst of several standard compliments, such as "famous," "divine," and "celebrated in song," Pindar refers to Athens as the "bulwark of Greece." It is likely that he would then proceed to explain how this term was justified. A reference to the battle of Artemisium is appropriate to that defense: Athens' role during the Persian Wars was primarily naval; Artemisium was the first naval battle against the Persians; and Athens held that the final victory over the Persians was achieved at Salamis. By defeating the Persians in the two naval battles, Athens could be considered the "bulwark of Greece."

The content of the poem from which these two fragments survive is unknown. Nevertheless, we can infer the subject from both their content and the context in which they are quoted. I suggest that in this poem, Pindar set about the task of redeeming the outcome of the battle of Artemisium, converting it from being at best a stalemate to a glorious and significant victory. Pindar refers to Athens as the "bulwark of Greece" and proceeds to mention the battle of Artemisium and implies its contribution to Athens' status.[6] Since Artemisium alone did not win the Wars, it alone cannot account for the description of Athens as the "bulwark." This suggests that the subject of the poem is Athens' role in the Persian Wars. The description of Athens implies that Athens took a leading role in the defeat of the Persians. Since their role was primarily naval, the poem likely took an Athenian, pro-navy perspective on the war; the poem did not restrict itself to Artemisium but instead narrated the Athenian contribution as a whole.

---

[6] The name "Artemisium" does not appear in the fragments. Nevertheless, that the other sources (e.g., Plutarch *de glor. Ath.* 7 and *Vit. Them.* 8.2) that quote the fragment are able to identify it, suggests that it did appear explicitly in the poem.

Pindar describes the battle of Artemisium as a κρηπίς, "foundation." Since a foundation left on its own is incomplete and therefore inconsequential, the word necessarily looks forward to something that is to be built upon it; a foundation is not the entire process, but instead simply the first step in it.[7] Pindar identifies the foundation as that of Greece's freedom. Therefore, the structure implied by the word "foundation" must be equivalent to the liberation of Greece from the Persian threat. This was accomplished not simply through Artemisium but Salamis as well. Artemisium can be seen as the foundation of the ultimate victory since it was there that the Athenians first learned the importance of courage in the face (ἀρχὴ . . . ὄντως τοῦ νικᾶν τὸ θαρρεῖν [Plut. *Vit. Them.* 8.1-2]). Pindar could have ended the poem with Salamis as the place where the Athenians put the courage they learned at Artemisium into practice, and as the place where the ultimate victory was won. Pindar's poem ignores the contribution of the Spartans and the other allies, ascribing the victory in the war to the Athenians alone: they were the architects not only of the foundation, but also of the victory itself.[8]

The date of the poem is unknown, although we can guess as to its relative date. Since the poem refers to Artemisium as the "shining foundation of freedom," the poem must have been written after that freedom had been assured. This could not have been immediately after the battle of Artemisium, since the Persians were still advancing against the Greek world and safety, still more freedom, were in question. Instead, the poem must have been written at some point after the Persians had been driven from the Greek world.

---

[7] Compare Pindar, *Pyth.* 7.1-3. Pindar refers to his proem as the "foundation of song" (κρηπῖδ' ἀοιδᾶν) in honour of the victor. As with the metaphor concerning Artemisium, the foundation here also implies something to be built upon it; in this case, that something is the ode itself, which conveys the praise due to the victor.

[8] *Contra* van der Weiden, who sees Artemisium as a defeat and seeks to interpret the poem in that light: Pindar mentioned it simply because there the Athenians displayed courage and valour, which were lacking at Salamis (1991, 209). She is mistaken. The courage and valour displayed by the Athenians at Salamis is widely attested in the sources and it is unlikely that a poem composed for an Athenian audience would have implied otherwise.

The lavish characterization of Athens (fr. 76) may imply a celebration of Athens rather than a memorial of its dead. This is, however, not certain. A celebration of Athens for its role in driving the Persians from the Greek mainland could include a celebration of those who died in achieving that goal. Nevertheless, that celebration may not have included lamentation for the dead or consolation for the survivors. Instead, as Pindar sought to redeem what was at best a stalemate and at worse a defeat, I think he focused on Athens and its great achievement, putting the battle into a positive light. He could certainly have mentioned the fallen, but likely did so in such a way as to enhance their glory and that of Athens in the defeat of the Persians.[9]

SIMONIDES' LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Although both Simonides and Aeschylus stand at the beginning of the poetic tradition of the Persian Wars, they had markedly different approaches to that tradition. This difference derives partly from the poetic genres in which they worked and their target audiences. Unlike Aeschylus and Timotheus, Simonides appears not to have used Persian characters or to have adopted the fiction of presenting the Persians' point of view. Instead, he appears to have kept the focus on the Greek forces.

M.L. West, relying upon the text of the elegiac fragments to determine the circumstances of the poem's performance, defined eight more-or-less distinct performance venues for elegy, including formal and informal military settings, symposia and *komoi*, and public festivals.[10] E.L. Bowie convincingly refutes the majority of West's categories, demonstrating that West took too literal an approach to the text and did not consider the effect on the text of artistic and literary license: e.g., martial and marine imagery need not mean that the elegy was first performed in a military or sea-faring context.[11] Instead, Bowie demonstrates convincingly that the majority of elegy was performed at symposia or during the accompanying *komos*.[12]

---

[9] We can compare Pericles' funeral oration (as recorded by Thucydides) and its emphasis on the glories of Athens.

Bowie accepts the final category advanced by West, namely "aulodic competitions at public festivals," a performance venue confirmed by the ancient sources.[13] Bowie argues that these public festivals were the occasion for a different style of elegy: lengthy, narrative, story-telling poems. Here Bowie again rejects the conclusions of West's influential study of elegy. West asserted that elegy did not contain "narrative for its own sake"; rather what appears to be narrative in the extant fragments is in fact included simply for the purpose of martial or political exhortation, or to convey some moral for the present.[14] Bowie argues that a separate class of elegy, namely narrative elegy, did exist, differing from sympotic elegy in scale and content: it was substantially longer; narrated events of both the distant and the recent past; and celebrated not the aristocratic values found in sympotic elegy but rather "the common ancestry and achievements of the city."[15] It is in this category that we can class Simonides' elegies on the Persian Wars.

---

[10] M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 10-13.

[11] Bowie 1986, 15-21.

[12] D.E. Gerber objects to the distinction made between the two venues, noting that the *komos* was "simply an extension or aftermath of the symposium" (Douglas E. Gerber, "Elegy," in Gerber, ed., *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997], 93).

[13] Bowie 1986, 27-34; West 1974, 13. Pausanias 10.7.5-6 records an inscription commemorating the poet Echembrotus' victory at the Pythian games for "songs and elegies" (μέλεα καὶ ἐλέγους); [Plutarch] *de musica* quotes an inscription alluding to elegiac competitions at the Panathenaea (1134a).

[14] West 1974, 14.

[15] Bowie 1986, 33.

Before I turn to Simonides' elegies, I will first examine other historical elegies; this may help to flesh out our understanding of the form and function of Simonides' elegies. In support of Bowie's theory of the existence of lengthy elegies performed at public festivals, Bowie offers the seventh-century poet Mimnermus of Smyrna whose *Smyrneis* narrated events from Gyges' invasion of mainland Greece ca. 670-660 (*IEG*^{2} 13-13a; =frr. 13-14 Allen).[16] A scholiast quotes two lines describing a king's army on a battlefield; Pausanias' statement that Mimnermus narrated the battle between Smyrna and Gyges has been taken to pinpoint the topic (9.29.4). The length of the *Smyrneis* is suggested by the presence of a title, the existence of a proem mentioning two generations of Muses (Paus. 9.29.4; =fr. 13 *IEG*^{2}; fr. 14 Allen),[17] and the inclusion of direct speech (*IEG*^{2} 13a; =fr. 13 Allen).[18]

Archibald Allen attempts to determine the exact length of the *Smyrna* and suggests it was approximately 400-500 lines. He asserts that the topic, one single battle, does not lend itself to lengthier treatment. Allen's claim is groundless. We cannot use topic to determine length: we have extant 205 lines of Timotheus' certainly lengthier treatment of the battle of Salamis,[19] while the *Iliad* narrates in twenty-four books only a few days of the Trojan War. Somewhat more convincing is Allen's argument for the length of the *Smyrneis* based on the evidence of Callimachus. Callimachus refutes criticism that he has not written one continuous song of thousands of lines, on the topic of kings and heroes (*Aetia* fr. 1 Pf.). In his defense, he states: τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν / . . .] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή, "of the two types of poetry, the small ones and not the *Big Woman* taught that Mimnermus is sweet" (*Aetia* fr. 1.11-12 Pf.).[20] Allen argues that Callimachus contrasts Mimnermus' epic-style *Smyrneis*, alluded to here as the *Big Woman*, with his individual, small-scale elegies, both styles which are collected in the *Nanno* (essentially, an anthology of Mimnermus' elegy).[21] Callimachus' complaint takes on added force if the smaller-scale elegies are contrasted with a "big" one of only 400-500 lines.[22] Ultimately, however, we cannot accurately determine the length of a lost poem. While we need not accept Allen's length as concrete, we can nonetheless accept his arguments for an elegy that was longer than customary and that narrated an episode of near-contemporary history. Unlike Simonides, Mimnermus was not an eyewitness to the war, but rather learned about it from his ancestors (ἐμεῦ προτέρων πεύθομαι [*IEG*^{2} 14; =fr. 15.2 Allen]). Nevertheless, Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* is evidence for elegy on events of the recent rather than mythological past.

---

[16] A. Allen, ed., *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993). For the debate surrounding Mimnermus' identity as a Smyrnean or Colophonian, see Allen 13-14; Allen, convincingly, favours Smyrna.

[17] Alcman too identifies two distinct generations of Muses (*PMG* 8.9 [the daughters of Mnemosyne and, presumably, Zeus] and test. B and C [the daughters of Ouranus and Earth]). Boedeker suggests that the two generations of Muses may have controlled two different realms: the older generation controlled mythic time, the younger, historical time (quoted by Ian Rutherford, "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 42 n.41). On this reading, Mimnermus would have departed from the customary role of the Mnemosynean Muses as the overseers of heroic/mythic time.

[18] Allen 1993, 9 and 23.

[19] The extant portion of Timotheus' *Persians* opens with the battle of Salamis nearly won and the Persians in flight; the final thirty-four lines of the poem are devoted to Timotheus' literary merits. It is impossible to determine how much of the battle scene is lost. We do, however, have fragments from the earlier, missing, sections that suggest both narrative and Themistocles' ruse. From this, we can infer that Timotheus narrated not simply the battle but the preliminaries to it as well. Since the preserved text is made up of a series of

---

detailed and discrete vignettes during the closing scenes of the battle, we can assume that the missing portion was similarly detailed. This could easily add up to a length of more than 500 lines.

[20] My translation has been guided by Allen's discussion of this passage (1993, 23-6).

[21] The *Big Woman* is identified as the *Smyrneis* because the Amazon Smyrna was considered to be the founder of the city of Smyrna. The *Smyrneis* need not necessarily refer to its foundation for the nickname to signify; the Hellenistic poets, and Callimachus in particular, were fond of obscure and recondite references. For a history of the quest to identify the *Big Woman*, see Allen 1993, 146-56.

[22] Allen 1993, 25.

Bowie also advances as a historical elegist the seventh-century Spartan poet Tyrtaeus, whose *Eunomia* (frr. 1-4 *IEG*^{2}) took as its topic the history of Spartan government.[23] The *Suda* attributes five books to Tyrtaeus, one of which is the *Eunomia*.[24] That the *Eunomia* had a title and may have been a self-contained book suggest that it was a lengthy poem. Attributed to the *Eunomia* are fragments concerning the divine right of kings (fr. 2), the Spartans' divine right to their land (fr. 2), and the oracle that established the *Rhetra*, Sparta's political system (fr. 4). These fragments suggest that, like Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus used elegy to reflect at length upon contemporary events.

Less secure are two other parallels offered by Bowie: the *Foundation of Colophon and Colonization of Elea* by Xenophanes of Colophon (ca. 565-470), and the *Archaeologia of the Samians*, attributed to Semonides of Amorgos (early seventh century).[25] Diogenes Laertius provides the title of Xenophanes' poem and notes that the poem was in 2000 ἔπη (9.20). The elegiac poets use ἔπη to refer to their own poetry, and by the second century AD the term meant simply "lines of writing."[26] Xenophanes did, however, write hexametric poetry as well and we cannot discount the possibility that the *Foundation* was hexametric rather than elegiac. The historical-sounding title does not enable us to decide between the two genres since epic was also used to narrate historical events.[27] Although fr. 3 *IEG*^{2}, describing the luxurious habits of the Colophonians, is elegiac and so might be taken to support the identification of the *Foundation* as elegiac, its content is equally appropriate to Xenophanes' more philosophical and moral poetry; it cannot therefore be securely assigned to the *Foundation*.

---

[23] For the date and nationality of Tyrtaeus, see Gerber 1997, 102-3 and, for more detail, C. Prato, ed., *Tirteo* (Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1968), 1-26.

[24] The *Suda* provides the title *Politeia*, with Strabo's *Eunomia* being generally accepted as an alternate title for the same poem. I will refer to it as the *Eunomia*.

[25] For the date of Xenophanes, see Gerber 1997, 127; for that of Semonides, see C.G. Brown, "Iambos," in Gerber 1997, 70.

[26] Bowie 1986, 32 n.100; C.M. Bowra, "Xenophanes on the Luxury of Colophon," in *On Greek Margins* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), 121.

[27] Hexametric poems on historical topics include the eight-century Eumelus' *Corinthiaca* and the sixth-century Asius' genealogical poem on the history of Samos (see pages 141 - 142).

Our evidence for the *Archaeologia* comes from corrupt entries in the *Suda*, which transmits information belonging to Semonides of Amorgos under his own name, and the names of Simonides of Ceos and Sim(m)ias of Rhodes, the third-century lexicographer.[28] The title of the *Archaeologia* itself appears not under Semonides' name but that of Simias of Rhodes. It is thought to belong to Semonides because of the greater suitability of the topic to Semonides, a founder of the Samian colony of Amorgos, than to the Rhodian poet. There are, however, good reasons for distrusting the evidence of the *Suda* and the existence of the *Archaeologia*. As C.G. Brown observes, the historical record preserves no trace of the *Archaeologia*, either in references to or citations of the poem, and the level of corruption in the *Suda*, our only source for the poem, is difficult to explain away.[29] It is, therefore, better to discount Semonides and the *Archaeologia* as evidence for historical, narrative, elegy, than to accept, selectively, the somewhat corrupt evidence of the *Suda*.

A contemporary of Simonides, Panyassis of Halicarnassis (ca. 500-450), is also credited with historical elegy, the *Ionica*.[30] The *Suda* ascribes to Panyassis a 7000-line pentametric poem on the subject of the early Athenian kings, Codrus and Nelus, and the Ionian colonies (frr. 24, 25, and 29 Matthews). That this is an elegiac poem rather than pentametric was first suggested by J.P. Tzschirner and is generally accepted.[31] Tzschirner cites a scholiast on the second-century AD metrist Hephaestion, who claims elegy as a synonym for pentameter; this allows us to understand the *Suda*'s notice as a reference to an elegiac rather than pentametric *Ionica*. As Matthews notes, a 7000-line pentametric poem is unparalleled and "unthinkable."[32] Matthews also suggests that the interest in Ionian colonies by early Athenian kings might have been prompted by the experiences of Athens with the Ionian colonies before and during the Persian Wars.[33] If he is correct, then the loss of Panyassis' poem, which would serve to flesh out our understanding of Greek, and likely Athenian, interest in the Persian Empire, is lamentable.

---

[28] The sources disagree as to the correct spelling of his name. I will refer to him as "Simias."

[29] Brown 1997, 71 n.9.

[30] For the date and nationality of Panyassis, see Victor J. Matthews, *Panyassis of Halikarnassos* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 6-19; and see page 146.

Bowie argued that elegy had a strong history of narrating contemporary and near-contemporary events. Although many of his arguments were based on minimal evidence, the appearance of new evidence in the form of Simonides' elegy on Plataea, which does appear to narrate at length an episode of recent history, suggests that Bowie was correct in his theory. It is in the tradition of lengthy, narrative elegy that we can situate Simonides and his elegies on the Persian Wars.[34] Bowie suggests, tentatively and with due regard for the tenuous nature of the fragmentary evidence, that in such narrative elegy the poet differed from his epic counterpart: the elegist narrates events from the recent rather than far distant past; could introduce himself into the poem as a source of information; could offer personal evaluations of the action; and paid due attention to chronology.[35] If Bowie is correct, we can perhaps see the foreshadowing of prose history in elegies on historical topics.

---

[31] J.P. Tzschirner, ed., *Panyasidis Halicarnassei Heracleadis Fragmenta* (Bratislava, 1842); cited by Matthews 1979, 26.

[32] Matthews 1979, 26.

[33] Matthews 1979, 28.

[34] Bowie 1986, 27-33.

We can therefore conclude that narrative elegies did exist and could take historical subjects as their topics; these were lengthy poems to be delivered in a public setting. As is to be expected in a society that believed in deities who took an active interest in mortal affairs, the gods could, and did, intervene in activities on the human plane; their interventions would then be included in the accounts of contemporary matters.

Turning to Simonides, we find that Simonides' nearness to the events of the Persian Wars is guaranteed by the dates of his life. 'Simonides' 28 *FGE* and the Parian Marble provide the traditional dates for Simonides' life: ca. 556-468. 'Simonides' 28 *FGE* celebrates the poet's victory at Athens in the dithyrambic contest. It claims to have been composed by Simonides and states that he was eighty years old in 477/6 (the archonship of Adeimantus). This date is in agreement with the first of two conflicting dates given by the *Suda* for the birth of Simonides, 556-553 (the 56th Olympiad); the *Suda* also gives the dates 532-529 (the 62nd Olympiad). The Parian Marble gives 468 as the date of Simonides' death and mentions that he lived ninety years.[36]

---

[35] Bowie 1986, 29-30.

[36] Stella challenged the traditional birth date on several grounds (1946, 1-24). Stella instead advocated adopting the later birth date given in the *Suda*, which would lower the start date of Simonides' lifetime by approximately thirty years, thus effectively canceling the perceived difficulties of the traditional date. Nevertheless, John Molyneux has convincingly refuted Stella's arguments and upheld the traditional date (John H. Molyneux, *Simonides: A Historical Study* [Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducchi, 1992]).

THE EVIDENCE FOR SIMONIDES AND ITS LIMITATIONS

It is unfortunate that Simonides' poems on the Persian Wars, like much of his other poetry, are almost completely lost. We are, however, grateful for the remarkable discoveries at Oxyrhynchus that have restored fragments of Simonides' poems on the battles of Artemisium (*POxy*. 3965 frr. 12, 13 and 20 [=*IEG*^{2} 1-4]), Salamis (*POxy*. 2327 [=*IEG*^{2} 5-9]), and Plataea (*POxy*. 3965 frr. 1 and 2 and *POxy*. 2327 frr. 6 and 27 [=*IEG*^{2} 10-18]).[37] In addition to the elegiac poems commemorating the battles, we had already extant a lyric poem in honour of those who fell at Thermopylae (*PMG* 89).

In addition to the poetic fragments there is anecdotal evidence for Simonides' poetry concerning the Persian Wars. The *Suda* provides a catalogue of genres in which Simonides wrote as well as a list of titles of individual works. It records (s.v. Σιμωνίδης) γέγραπται αὐτῷ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ ἡ Καμβύσου καὶ Δαρείου βασιλεία καὶ Ξέρξου ναυμαχία καὶ ἡ ἐπ' 'Αρτεμισίωι ναυμαχία δι' ἐλεγείας, ἡ δ' ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μελικῶς, "Simonides wrote, in the Doric dialect, the *Reign of Cambyses and Darius*, the *Sea-battle of Xerxes*, and, in elegiacs, the *Sea-battle at Artemisium*, and the lyric *Sea-battle at Salamis*." Without accepting the *Suda*'s evidence at face value, it nonetheless provides a place from which to start our examination of Simonides' narrations of the Persian Wars.

Our knowledge of the content of the elegies is hampered by their fragmentary nature. A readable text, in particular of the Plataean elegy, is the result of supplements and restorations proposed largely by Parsons and West.[38] West's text of the "New Simonides" is commendable, presents a remarkably clear and coherent picture of Simonides' proem and various elements of the battle of Plataea, and is the standard text used by scholars.[39] Nevertheless, West's text is heavily supplemented and so we run the risk of doing literary criticism "from square brackets": basing interpretations of a poem on a heavily restored and supplemented text. [40] This practice results in readings that are based at least as much on the restored text as they are on what is actually preserved.

---

[37] Since West *IEG*^{2} is the standard text for Simonides' elegies and is more readily available than the Oxyrhynchus texts, I will use West's numbering, unless referring to matters of the papyrus text itself.

This is not to suggest that all restorations or supplements are inherently untrustworthy. It is, of course, possible to restore such things as proper names, common words, or formulaic phrases, especially if only a few letters of a word are missing. It must, however, be recognized that, because of poetry's reliance on often unique imagery and metaphor, the sense of the whole is not always readily apparent from the fragmentary remains. Considerations of metre can often help to restore individual words missing in poetic texts, but it is rather more difficult to restore the content of a lacunose text.

In the case of Simonides' elegy on Plataea, West's restoration was facilitated by reference to Herodotus' account of the same battle (9.25-89). The mechanics of restoring incomplete and even missing words and phrases were made easier since the sense of the whole could be inferred from Herodotus' full and detailed account. Nevertheless, reliance on the prose of Herodotus to supplement the poetry of Simonides runs the risk of putting

---

[38] P.J. Parsons, "3965. Simonides, Elegies," *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 59 (1992): 4-49; West, Simonides 11 *IEG*^{2}.

[39] West's text was used as the basis for the special APA panel, the *Arethusa* volume that resulted from it, and by most subsequent authors. Antonio Aloni, who largely accepts West's text, provides additional supplements in his edition for the *lacunae* left by West (*Lirici Greci: Alcmane, Stesicoro, Simonide* [Milan: Arnoldo Mondadoni, 1994], 132-42).

[40] E. Badian coined the phrase in his article "History from Square Brackets," *ZPE* 79 (1989): 51-70.

Herodotus into poetry rather than recovering the text of Simonides.[41] We are also in danger of putting the modern editor's vision of the lost text into poetry.

The problems inherent in basing theories and analyses on heavily restored texts are neatly illustrated by *POxy*. 2327 (=*IEG*^{2} 21).[42] Both Adelmo Barigazzi and M.L. West examined the papyrus and produced widely divergent yet equally plausible restorations and interpretations.[43] Their results are, however, mutually exclusive.

Barigazzi, concluding, "con sufficiente sicurezza," that the ascription of *POxy*. 2327 fr. 31 to Simonides' poem on Salamis is correct, identifies two other fragments of that same papyrus as also belonging to the Salamis poem.[44] He combines fr. 1 with the first column of fr. 2, restoring words where necessary, and produces a largely readable block of text which hints at a naval battle. Barigazzi sees in the line κ]υα[νέ]ῳ δ’ ἐλεφαντι[νεον καὶ ἐμί]σγετο φο[ῖνιξ, "red mixed white with blue" (fr. 1.7) "una discrizione coloristica della battaglia," in which the blue of the sea and the white of the foam are mixed with the red of blood. He also advances νιφάδων, "snowstorm," of line 8 as indicative of a battle scene, noting Pindar's metaphorical use of the term for "battle" (*Isth.* 3.17).[45]

---

[41] Antonio Aloni, "The Proem of the Simonides Elegy on the battle of Plataea (Sim. Frs. 10-18 W^2) and the Circumstances of its Performance," in *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, eds., Lowell Edmunds and Robert W. Wallace (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 8 and 11. West recognizes the limitations of his method, admitting that his supplements are "of course quite uncertain in detail, but it is my hope that they correctly reflect Simonides' train of thought" (1993, 6). See also Boedeker 2001b on the relationship between the accounts of Simonides and Herodotus.

[42] E. Lobel, "2327: Early Elegies," *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22 (1954): 67-76. Lobel identified Simonides as the author on the basis of other known Simonidean manuscripts that were written by the same hand. Lobel recognizes that this is not conclusive, but justifies the identification since "where the field is so large and the prospect of verifying an ascription so small, nothing is to be gained by multiplying guesses" (67).

[43] Adelmo Barigazzi, "Nuovi frammenti delle elegie di Simonide (Ox. Pap. 2327)," *MH* 20 (1963): 61-76; M.L. West, "Simonides Redivivus," *ZPE* 98 (1993): 11-12.

[44] Barigazzi 1963, 65. On Simonides' Salamis elegy, see pages 70-72.

The text of the fragment contains the speech of a person who laments his inability to save his men (ο]ὐ δύναμαι ψυχ[ῶν] πεφυλαγμένος ε[ἶ]ναι ὀπηδός, "I am not able to be a faithful guardian of lives" [3]) and witnesses the consequences of his unjust actions (ἡ]μετέρης εἶδον τέρμ[ατ᾽ ἀνα]ιδείης, "I saw the end of my shamelessness" [6]). Barigazzi identifies the speaker as "un incarico ufficiale."[46] If, however, we accept Barigazzi's identification of the subject as the battle of Salamis, it is possible to suggest a more precise identification of the speaker. That the official is Persian and not Greek is evident by the sense of defeat in the fragment: the speaker is helpless; holds himself responsible for the deaths of his men; and characterizes his actions as shameless. These sentiments are suitable not to a victorious Greek but to a defeated Persian.

A likely candidate for speaker is Xerxes, the Persian king and leader of the expedition. The image of the Great King witnessing the destruction of his fleet and his plans for conquest at Salamis was a common *topos* in accounts of the battle. Furthermore, ὕβριν, "*hubris* (arrogance)" at the end of line 9 (surrounded, unfortunately, by lacunae) is suitable to the Greek view of Xerxes and his campaign at Salamis. The *hubris* of the Persians, evident in Xerxes' yoking the Hellespont, was a common motif in accounts of the Wars with the battle of Salamis and Xerxes' subsequent defeat commonly viewed as Xerxes reaping the consequences of his *hubris*. On Barigazzi's reading, we have indications of how Simonides narrated the battle of Salamis, which included the image of

---

[45] Barigazzi 1963, 68-9. Barigazzi notes a similar colourful element in the descriptions of the battle in Timotheus' *Persians*.

[46] Barigazzi 1963, 66.

Xerxes' lamenting his responsibility for the defeat and the presentation of Salamis as the end of the Persian Wars. That Salamis is presented as the end of the Wars suggests an Athenian audience.

It is possible to restore the text in a different way, resulting in a dramatically altered text and transforming the identification and interpretation of the poem. West reads it as a contemplative poem and includes the fragments with the *convivalia* (=Simonides 21 *IEG*²). What in Barigazzi's text is Xerxes' regret for the lives (ψυχ[ῶν]) he destroyed becomes, in West's text, Simonides' renunciation of "circumspection in ministering to his soul" (ψυχ[ῇ]).[47] Simonides' introspection then leads him to consider the life he has led since his childhood ended and he became an adult (Barigazzi's τέρμ[ατ' ἀνα]ιδείης, "end of shamelessness" becomes West's τέρμ[ατα πα]ιδείης, "end of childhood"). Where Barigazzi sees the red of blood mingling with the blue and white of the sea, West sees an image of "the burgeoning of sexual vigour" wherein dark hairs sprout on once-smooth thighs and indicate the end of youth (printing κ]υά[ν]εον δ' ἐλεφαντίνεόν [τ' ἀνεμί]σγετο φέ[γγος, "the white gleam mingled with dark").[48] The snow (νιφάδων) that Barigazzi read as a metaphor for battle, West sees as a metaphor for aging: melting snow reveals patches of colour, representing the newly-grown hairs of adulthood darkening the previously white thighs of youth (printing ποίην] δ' ἐκ νιφάδων [ἦν νεοθηλέ' ἰ]δεῖν, "to see grass newly-sprouted from snow").[49]

---

[47] West 1993, 11. In his text, West prints the vocative ψυχή but favours the dative ψυχῇ in his reading. Dirk Obbink, however, rules out the dative, noting that the scribe consistently uses an iota adscript and that there is space for only one character ("The Genre of Plataea: Generic Unity in the New Simonides," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 84 n.79).

[48] West 1993, 11. Eleanor Irwin studied the vocabulary of colour and concluded that, to the epic poets, κυανεός signified a dark colour; with Simonides, the term began to signify the specific "blue" but without ever losing its more general meaning of "dark" (*Colour Terms in Greek Poetry* [Toronto: Hakkert, 1974], 79-110, esp. 103-10). We cannot, therefore, use the specified colour, κυανεός , to reject West's or Barigazzi's reading of this line.

Barigazzi's text and interpretation have not found much favour;[50] West's, however, have.[51] Both Barigazzi and West present plausible texts, offering parallels for their interpretations and reasons for their supplements but arriving at mutually exclusive texts and analyses.[52] Their readings rely too heavily on their supplements of lacunae and restorations of fragmentary words to inspire confidence that either editor has arrived at the correct text or even an approximation of it. Their widely divergent texts and readings demonstrate the necessity of approaching all fragmentary texts, especially those that have been heavily supplemented, with caution.

---

[49] Dirk Obbink accepts West's text and analysis of the fragment, but argues that it forms part of the Plataea poem, coming from a section in which Simonides addresses himself (2001, 84).

[50] D.E. Gerber rejects Barigazzi's attribution as "improbable" ("Greek Lyric Poetry since 1920 Part II: from Alcman to Fragmenta Adespota," *Lustrum* 36 [1994]: no. 1704); Molyneux' (1992) omission of these fragments in his analysis of Simonides' poetry on the Persian Wars implies that he too rejects Barigazzi's identification of the fragments as forming part of the Salamis poem. A. J. Podlecki also rejects the fragments and offers explicit reasons: he requires something more substantial to connect the colours of line 7 with a naval battle; points out that Pindar's metaphorical use of νίφας to mean "battle" is made explicit by Pindar's restrictive use of πολέμοιο; and argues that "a sea-battle could hardly be called a 'snowstorm' without further qualification" ("Simonides: 480," *Historia* 17 [1968]: 269). In partial defense of Barigazzi, it is possible that the large lacuna after νιφάδων contained the necessary qualifier; this is, of course, completely unverifiable.

[51] See, *inter alios*, Boedeker and Sider who accept the "obviously erotic thighs" of West's text ("Introduction," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 5); David Sider, "Fragments 1-22 W^2: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 25-6; Ian Rutherford, who notes that West "rightly interprets the fragment as erotic" (2001, 51); and Parsons who distinguishes between the two faces of Simonides displayed in the New Simonides: the "sympotic elegist" who "dwells on dark hair and ivory skin (fr. 21)" in contrast to the "historical elegist" of the martial poems ("'These Fragments we have Shored against our Ruin'," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 64).

[52] For Barigazzi's *apparatus criticus* and the rationale for his emendations, see his pages 66-7; for the parallels offered by West, see his pages 11-12 and notes 23-6 (1993). West's supplements are guided largely by *petitio principii*; he earlier stated "[t]here can be no doubt about the subject matter of the lines once it is recognized, and probable supplements follow" (1974, 167).

SIMONIDES: THE POEMS

I: THE *BATTLE OF MARATHON*

According to the anonymous *Life* of Aeschylus, Simonides and Aeschylus competed with elegies on the battle of Marathon. Simonides won and the defeated Aeschylus retired to Hieron's court (*Vita* 8). We need not accept the story of the consequences of Aeschylus' defeat at face value.[53] Nevertheless, Plutarch suggests that the anecdote about the composition of the elegy is correct. Plutarch notes that the orator Glaucias used Aeschylus' elegies to determine the position of the battle wings at Marathon (*Quaest. Conv.* 1.10.3 [=Aesch. 1 *IEG*^{2}]). If Glaucias and Plutarch are correct that Aeschylus wrote an elegy on Marathon, this could lend weight to the tradition that Simonides too wrote such an elegy, perhaps in competition with Aeschylus. If Aeschylus and Simonides did compete with elegies on Marathon, this lends some support to Bowie's theory regarding the performance of elegies in public competitions. If this is correct, it is unfortunate that, as is so often the case, neither of their elegies has survived. We can, however, infer with confidence that Simonides and Aeschylus composed their elegies for an Athenian audience.

II: THE *BATTLE OF ARTEMISIUM*

The *Suda*'s references to τήν (ναυμαχίαν) ἐπ' 'Αρτεμισίῳ δι' ἐλεγείας, "the elegiac *Sea-battle at Artemisium*" and τήν (ναυμαχίαν) τ' ἐν Σαλαμῖνι μελικῶς,

---

[53] Mary R. Lefkowitz has convincingly demonstrated the unreliability of the anonymous *Lives* as evidence for the actual lives of their subjects. The *Lives* are the results of the biographical tradition and the tendency

"the lyric *Sea-battle at Salamis*" have occasioned some debate, in particular with respect to the metres of the poems. The question of the correct metre of the poems is necessary to decide what surviving fragments can be assigned to which poem and hence to determine the content. Priscian, the Latin grammarian (fifth- to sixth-century AD), preserves two brief fragments, attributing them to "Simonides in ἐπ' Ἀρτεμισίῳ ναυμαχίᾳ in dimetro catalectico," "Simonides in his *Sea-battle at Artemisium* in catalectic dimeters" (*de metr. Terent.* 24 [=533 *PMG*]). This has been taken as evidence that the *Suda* was (again) mistaken in its facts and that Simonides' poem on Artemisium was in lyric rather than elegiac metre.[54] This belief persisted until the publication of the "New Simonides," containing not only a hitherto lost elegy on Plataea but also fragments of an elegiac poem on Artemisium.[55] This discovery, unfortunately, did not resolve the question of the poem's metre but rather cast it further into doubt.

Ian Rutherford neatly summarized the conflicting possibilities: Simonides wrote two poems on Artemisium, one elegiac (which includes the fragments from Oxyrhynchus) and one lyric (which includes the quotations in Priscian); Simonides wrote an elegiac poem, which Priscian misidentified as a lyric; the *Suda* misidentified the lyric Artemisium poem as elegiac and the elegies in *POxy.* 3965 come from a separate poem (perhaps the one on Salamis which the *Suda* misidentified as lyric); or all of the fragments concerning naval battles come from Simonides' one poem, Ξέρξου ναυμαχία, "*Sea-battle of Xerxes,*" which included a section on Artemisium in elegiacs

---

of the ancient critics to use poetry as evidence for the actions of the authors (*Lives of the Greek Poets* [London: Duckworth, 1981]).

[54] E.g., C.M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*, rev. 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 342; D.E. Gerber, *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek. Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1970), 309-10; Page 1981, 276; Molyneux 1992, 158.

[55] Parsons 1992, 6.

and one on Salamis in lyrics, with the discrete sections giving rise to separate titles.[56] Having summarized the issue, Rutherford concluded "I see no way of resolving this issue."[57] Rutherford's caution is understandable. Each of the conflicting theories deserves consideration and the issue is unlikely to be settled conclusively in the absence of further miraculous recoveries from Oxyrhynchus (*vel sim.*). Nevertheless, I will offer some observations not to resolve this issue, but to minimize its complications and rule out some of the possibilities.

The theory that Simonides wrote one poem on the naval campaign against Xerxes, incorporating lyric and elegiac metres does have some merit. We find a parallel in Timotheus' *Persians*, which uses a variety of metres with no discernable metrical scheme to narrate the battle of Salamis. Nevertheless, certain considerations argue against accepting this solution to explain the references to Simonides' poems. Timotheus wrote approximately sixty to seventy years later than Simonides, in a very different musical and cultural climate. The *Persians* was the result of the dramatic changes in musical styles which took place over several decades and which culminated in the New Music.[58] The censure leveled against Timotheus for violating traditional music by mixing metres in his poems and the absence of similar charges against Simonides argue against Simonides' having done the same thing decades earlier. For this reason, I think we can reject the theory that Simonides wrote one poem on the whole naval campaign using both lyric and elegiac metres.

---

[56] Rutherford 2001, 35-6; there is a more detailed discussion in his earlier version of the article (=*Arethusa* 29 [1996]: 169-71).

[57] Rutherford 1996, 171.

[58] For the New Music, see pages 215 - 221

If Simonides wrote only one poem on Artemisium, using one metre throughout, was it elegiac, as the *Suda* says, or lyric, as Priscian says?[59] It is true that the *Suda* is often unreliable and it is not impossible that it misidentified the lyric Artemisium poem as elegiac. Nevertheless, we ought not to reject the *Suda*'s evidence out of hand, if we find corroboration in other sources, when our main reason for distrusting the *Suda* on this matter is the evidence of Priscian. Both the *Suda* (tenth century AD) and Priscian (fifth to sixth century AD) are late sources with no first hand knowledge of Simonides or his poetry. Instead, they relied on copies of his poems or on information found in other authors and there is no way to determine which of the two had the better source(s). It is equally likely that Priscian misidentified the elegiac poem as lyric as that the *Suda* erred. While the fragments Priscian quotes (*PMG* 533 A and B) are themselves lyric fragments, the rather nondescript content of the fragments does not guarantee that they come from Simonides' poem on Artemisium rather than his poem on Salamis. It is possible that Priscian or his source confused the two poems, especially since both poems take naval victories in the Persian Wars as their topic.

On the other hand, the elegiac fragments from Oxyrhynchus, although equally fragmentary, come from a papyrus which contains only elegiac verse and which are identifiable as Simonides' verses.[60] Furthermore, the fragments are informative as to the subject of the poem. In *POxy*. 3965 fr. 20.5, the remains]κάλαι[are found. The word is restorable to the proper name Κάλαιν, "Calais." Ζήτην καὶ, "Zetes and," which would fit the metre of a pentametric line, the traces of letters, and the diacritics, is a possible restoration of the preceding words.[61] Zetes and Calais are the sons of the North Wind, Boreas, who helped the Greeks at Artemisium: prior to the battle, the god severely damaged the Persian fleet with a storm (Hdt. 7.188-92). Zetes and Calais are at home in a poem on Artemisium while Boreas himself may be lurking in the traces of fr. 12.8: β.[ ]ρέ[.[62] *POxy*. 3965 therefore supports the *Suda*'s identification of the poem as elegiac, allowing us to conclude that Simonides did write an elegy on Artemisium.

---

[59] For the quotation from Priscian, see page 57.

[60] The content of *POxy*. 3965 overlaps with other, securely identified, fragments of Simonides' poems (Parsons 1992, 6).

While the evidence suggests that Simonides did write an elegy on the battle of Artemisium, there is no evidence to disprove the suggestion that Simonides wrote at least two poems, possibly in different metres, on Artemisium. The several city-states who fought at Artemisium could be expected to want to commemorate their role in that battle with song and to commission one, or more, from the leading poet of the day. I think that, notwithstanding any elegies on Artemisium that Simonides may (or may not) have written for other city-states, the preserved elegiac fragments (1-4 *IEG*^{2}), with their possible inclusion of Boreas, Zetes, and Calais, can be assigned to an elegy for the Athenians.

Boreas' aid to the Athenian fleet at Artemisium earned him great popularity at Athens; this popularity allows us to assign fragments alluding to his role at Artemisium to an elegy commissioned by the Athenians.[63] Boreas' familial relationship with the

---

[61] Parsons 1992, 41; compare Rutherford 2001, 36. The restoration is not, however, universally accepted. Obbink distrusts it, stating that it "seems to rest on the flimsiest of evidence" (2001, 81 n.65).

[62] Parsons comments that the doubtful letter after the β may actually be a flourish on the β rather than a separate letter, making the word β[ ]ρε[ ], thus strengthening the case for the restoration "Boreas" (1992, 39).

[63] The abduction of Oreithyia was the subject of numerous vase paintings as well as tragedies by Aeschylus (*TrGF* 3 fr. 281; see pages 135-136) and Sophocles (*TrGF* 4 fr. 956). For the abduction of Oreithyia in Choerilus' *Persica*, see page 172. For the vase paintings, see Sophia Kaempf-Dimitriadou, "Boreas," in *LIMC* (Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1994) vol. 3.1: 133-42 and vol. 3.2: 108-22. Walter R. Agard suggests that the interest in the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia resulted not only from Boreas' role in the battle of

Athenians helps with this assignment. Herodotus records how Athens was advised by an oracle to pray to their son-in-law for help prior to the battle of Artemisium (7.189).[64] According to legend, Boreas abducted Oreithyia, the daughter of Erechtheus, king of Athens; she then bore him Zetes and Calais. The Athenians transformed the daughter of their legendary King into the daughter of Athens itself; Athens would then stand as father-in-law to Boreas. The Athenians identified the son-in-law mentioned by the oracle and called upon Boreas. The god, in response to the pleas of his kin, obligingly responded with a storm destroying much of the Persian fleet (Hdt. 7.189-93).[65] With such a treatment Simonides could contribute to the glorification of Athens to whom assistance is granted not only because the gods favour them, but also because of their kinship with gods.

The story of Boreas would be appropriate to an elegy for the Athenians celebrating the battle of Artemisium. That Simonides also included the abduction of Oreithyia in his poem on Artemisium is suggested by the scholiast at *Argonautica* 1.211-5 who says that Simonides, in his *Sea-battle*, located the rape at Brilessus.[66] The

---

Artemisium, but also from Athens' interest in Thrace (Boreas' homeland), its reserves of grain, lumber, and its access to trade routes ("Boreas at Athens," *CJ* 61 [1966]: 245-6).

[64] λέγεται δὲ λόγος ὡς 'Αθηναῖοι τὸν Βορῆν ἐκ θεοπροπίου ἐπεκαλέσαντο, ἐλθόντος σφι ἄλλου χρηστηρίου τὸν γαμβρὸν ἐπίκουρον καλέσασθαι. Βορῆς δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἑλλήνων λόγον ἔχει γυναῖκα 'Αττικήν, 'Ωρείθυιαν τὴν 'Ερεχθέος, "a story is told that, because of an oracle, the Athenians called upon Boreas, when another oracle had come to them to call upon their son-in-law as an ally. Boreas, according to the Greek story, had an Athenian wife, Oreithyia, the daughter of Erechtheus" (Hdt. 7.189). It is interesting to see that the Athenians assume the superior role in their relationship with the god, considering themselves to be his father-in-law rather than the god to be their ancestor.

[65] West suggests that *POxy*. 3965 fr. 20.12 (θάλ]ασσαν ὑ[πο] τ[ρ]υγός, "the sea from its depths") may refer to the storm roused by the Boreads, which stirred up the sea from the seabed (1993, 3).

[66] τὴν δὲ 'Ωρείθυιαν Σιμωνίδης ἀπὸ Βριλησσοῦ ἁρπαγεῖσαν ἐπὶ τὴν Σαρπηδονίαν πέτραν τῆς Θρᾴκης ἐνεχθῆναι . . . ἡ δὲ 'Ωρείθυια 'Ερεχθέως θυγάτηρ, ἣν ἐξ 'Αττικῆς ἁρπάσας ὁ Βορέας ἤγαγεν εἰς Θρᾴκην, κἀκεῖσε συνελθὼν ἔτεκε Ζήτην καὶ Κάλαϊν, ὡς Σιμωνίδης ἐν τῇ Ναυμαχίᾳ, "Simonides says that Oreithyia was abducted from Brilessus and carried to the Sarpedon rock in Thrace...Oreithyia is the daughter of Erechtheus, whom Boreas abducted from Attica and took to Thrace, there she bore Zetes and Calais, as Simonides says in his *Sea-battle*" [=3 *IEG*^{2}]. Page claims the scholiast's

particular sea-battle can be determined by the greater suitability of Oreithyia to the battle of Artemisium, where her sons and husband played a pivotal role, rather than Salamis, where they were absent.

Oreithyia herself may be lurking in the ode in the phrase ἠΰ[κομοιο] κόρ[ης, "the girl with beautiful hair" (*POxy*. 3965 fr. 20.11).[67] The circumlocution "girl with beautiful hair" is a commonplace description for females and there is no guarantee that it here refers to Oreithyia. Another likely candidate is Artemis, from whom Artemisium took its name and to whom the Athenians dedicated tokens following the defeat of the Persians (Plut. *Vit. Them.* 8.5); such dedications suggest a role for Artemis in the battle, thus accounting for her appearance in the ode. Nevertheless, the likely presence of Oreithyia's husband and sons in the ode and the likelihood that Simonides narrated her abduction there might weigh more heavily in favour of identifying the "girl with the beautiful hair" as Oreithyia rather than Artemis.

While it is not impossible that Simonides narrated the myth of Oreithyia in a completely different poem, the likelihood of her presence and that of her family in the elegiac fragments from Oxyrhynchus, as well as the Athenian interest in her myth, suggest that the scholiast's reference to Simonides' account of the rape of Oreithyia is to Simonides' poem on Artemisium. That the scholiast can allude to both Oreithyia's abduction and the subsequent birth of Zetes and Calais while referring to Simonides' poem suggests that Simonides narrated both Oreithyia's history and its relevance to Athens during the battle of Artemisium. This in turn implies that Simonides blended the

---

comment as evidence for the lyric Artemisium poem (=*PMG* 534); West claims it for the elegiac (*sub* Simonides 3 *IEG*^{2}).

[67] Parsons notes that the restoration suits the metre, the traces of the letters, and the vacant space "admirably" (1992, 41).

historical battle at Artemisium with the mythical story of Oreithyia, perhaps offering the story of Oreithyia as an explanation for the storm that saved the Athenians.

Mention of the storm and even the storm's personification as Boreas could certainly be appropriate in an elegy for any of the other participating city-states. These elements could be narrated in a historically accurate and politically neutral fashion, devoid of pro-Athenian overtones, simply by omitting reference to the Athenian Oreithyia. The inclusion of her abduction has little relevance to the battle itself except to provide an Athenian tie to Boreas and his sons, Zetes and Calais. Her implied presence, if not as the "girl with the beautiful hair" then at least as the mother of Zetes and Calais, therefore suggests that the Artemisium ode was composed for an Athenian audience; the Athenians' divine kinship ties serve to enhance their status.

Further evidence for the content of the Artemisium elegy may be found in Himerius, a fourth-century AD rhetorician. Himerius, wishing to address the wind and pleading the poverty of his own poetic skills, alludes to a poem by Simonides in which the poet called upon the wind to blow favourably (*Or.* 12.32 [=*PMG* 535]). Wilamowitz used the appropriateness of an address to the wind to the context of the battle of Artemisium to claim this passage as an allusion to Simonides' poem on Artemisium.[68] That the Artemisium poem contained such an address is implied by Himerius' desire to call upon the wind in the style of Simonides (ἐκ τῆς Κείας μουσῆς[69]) and by the subsequent imperative (σχίζε, "cleave") in what may be a quotation, or paraphrase, from the poem.[70] The address to Boreas implies that the poem included a narration of the battle during which the Athenians called upon the Wind for help. The poem would then likely also include the narration of the help given, namely the destruction of the Persian fleet.

---

[68] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913), 207-8 and 208 n.1.

[69] Κείας is Gottlieb Wernsdorf's widely accepted emendation of οἰκείας (*Himerii Sophiste, Quae reperiri potuerunt* [Gottingen, 1790]). As Molyneux notes, Himerius' reference to 'my own Muse,' ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας μούσης, "would contradict his denial of his own poetic ability" (1992, 171 n.57).

Bowra rejects the evidence of the Himerius passage, objecting to the characterization of the wind as ἁπαλός, "gentle," arguing that the word is "inappropriate to Boreas."[71] Instead, he assigns it to Simonides' poem on Salamis arguing that the term is more appropriate to Zephyr and his role in that battle: as the defeated Persians attempted to withdraw, the West Wind began to blow, causing further damage to their ships (Hdt. 8.96.2). We can, however, reject this theory. That Himerius can refer to the wind's "own song" suggests that the wind played a significant role for which it received an ode in its honour. I would suggest that, unlike Boreas at Artemisium, Zephyr at Salamis had only a modest role and one which took place only after the Athenians had decisively defeated the Persians. Boreas caused massive destruction to the Persians prior to the battle of Artemisium and so affected the outcome of the battle by reducing the number of Persians the Greeks would have to face. Zephyr's actions, however, were confined to causing a small amount of damage following the Greeks' victory at Salamis.[72] Although we must not deny Simonides the opportunity for originality in his treatment of Salamis, there is no trace found in the other sources that the Greeks, and in particular, the Athenians gave Zephyr much credit for his role at the battle of Salamis. Salamis was viewed as a victory won by the Athenian navy; it is unlikely that Simonides would have denied the

---

[70] Bergk, following Schneidewin, suggests that the phrase ἁπαλὸς δ' ὑπὲρ κυμάτων χεόμενος πορφυρᾶ σχίζει περὶ τὴν πρῴραν τὰ κύματα, "being poured gently upon the waves, cleave the dark waves about the prow," is a quotation (1882, 397; = his fragment 25 "Hymn to the Wind"). The imperative σχίζε, "cleave" is an emendation of the manuscript's σχίζει ; that the emendation is necessary is guaranteed by subsequent content of the passage which uses the second person when speaking of the wind.

[71] Bowra 1961, 343.

Athenians, for whom the ode was most likely composed, full honour and glory for that victory. Finally, "[i]t seems entirely in order to assume that a poem addressed to Boreas and describing his destruction of the Persian ships might contain a plea to blow gently whenever the Athenians themselves should need a fair wind."[73] Such a plea would nicely juxtapose the wind's treatment of enemy ships with its treatment of its kin, thus enhancing the status of Athens.

That Simonides narrated the events of the battle of Artemisium in conjunction with the myth of Oreithyia's abduction and Boreas' assistance is further suggested by a scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica.* The scholiast glosses a reference to Sciathus (1.583-4) with the statement that, as Simonides shows, Sciathus is an island close to Euboea (ἡ παραθαλασσία. νῆσος γὰρ ἡ Σκίαθος ἐγγὺς Εὐβοίας, ἧς καὶ Σιμωνίδης μέμνηται [Simonides 1 *IEG*^{2}]). F.W. Schneidewin first assigned this allusion to the poem on Artemisium, since Sciathus is located off the coast of Magnesia, opposite Artemisium (Hdt. 7.176).[74] The coast of Sciathus was the site of a preliminary engagement between Persian and Greek ships, the results of which were transmitted to the Greeks by means of fire-signals stationed on Sciathus (Hdt. 7.179-83). A mention of Sciathus in a poem by Simonides could therefore occur in a poem on Artemisium. If Sciathus was mentioned, this suggests that the events of the battle on and around the island, and so presumably the other engagements of that battle, were narrated as well as elements from the distant past, such as Boreas' abduction of Oreithyia. In such a reading,

---

[72] Podlecki 1968, 265; Molyneux 1992, 162.

[73] Molyneux 1992, 161.

[74] F.W. Schneidewin, ed., *Simonidis Cei Carminum Reliquiae* (Brunswick, 1835), =his Simonides fr. 5. Page rejects Schneidewin's assessment and assigns the fragment to the "incerta" (=*PMG* 635).

Athens would not assign all credit for the victory to the god, but rather would allow the god to share in Athens' credit.

The presence of Boreas in the elegy not only suggests an Athenian audience but may also provide evidence for the date and place of the first performance. Herodotus records that the Athenians established a shrine to Boreas (7.189.3) and Wilamowitz traces the poem's commission and its first performance to the foundation of that shrine.[75] An ode narrating not only the god's personal history and familial relationship to the Athenians but also his assistance in contemporary matters would be appropriate to that setting. Wilamowitz supports his theory concerning the first performance of the poem with reference to the ode's narration of the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia, and with the address to Boreas suggested by the imperative σχίζει, "cleave" (Him. *Or.* 12.32 [=*PMG* 535]). As further support Wilamowitz cites a second passage in Himerius, in which the rhetorician describes the launching of a ship in a Panathenaic festival and the song of the Athenians summoning the wind to attend the launch. The wind, hearing "its own song" which Simonides wrote μετὰ τὴν θάλατταν, "after the events at sea,"[76] attends and provides a favouring wind (*Or.* 47.14 [=*PMG* 535]).[77] Wilamowitz' theory depends upon accepting a variant reading: οἰκείαν, "its own," of ms. R rather than κείαν, "Cean," of ms. A.[78] The reading οἰκείαν has merit. The two words look very much alike and a similar confusion between the two occurred in *Or.* 12 32.[79] The reference to the "Cean song" immediately before the relative clause with its explicit mention of Simonides' singing it is superfluous: the reference to Simonides' nationality signifies nothing that the mention of Simonides does not convey more clearly. Therefore, I accept the reading οἰκείαν: the wind's song is Simonides' song in its honour, composed to commemorate Boreas' role at Artemisium.

---

[75] Wilamowitz 1913, 207; Wilamowitz' theory is accepted by Podlecki (1968, 265) and Molyneux (1992, 163), albeit with some reservations.

[76] Wilamowitz explains the phrase μετὰ τὴν θάλατταν "also nachdem er auf dem Meere seine Gnade bewiesen hatte" (1913, 208). J.M. Edmonds agrees, emending the phrase to read μετὰ τὴν <κατὰ> θάλατταν <μάχην> (*Lyra Graeca*, vol. 2 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952]); David A. Campbell concurs (*Greek Lyric*, vol. 3 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991]). Page, however, disagrees, rejecting Wilamowitz' suggestion as "frustra" and the sense of the line as "obscurum" (1962, 278).

[77] Bowra assigns this reference to the Salamis poem because "[t]he wind here has not the same characteristics as that which scattered and smashed the Persian ships off Artemisium" since "it is following and favourable" while the wind at Artemisium could not be described as such (1962, 343). Nevertheless, it is possible that "the ode contained both these graphic references to the action of the wind at sea and a more general appeal to the wind to blow favourably" (Molyneux 1992, 161).

The site of the ode's first performance is debated. The scholiast to Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* (1.211-15) tells us that, according to Simonides, Oreithyia was snatched from Brilissus. The place "Brilissus" is unknown, which prompted Naeke to emend the text to read "Brilessus," a mountain in Attica.[80] According to Herodotus, however, the Athenians founded the shrine to Boreas at Ilissus (7.189.3). While the scene of the abduction did vary in the sources, presumably were the ode composed for performance at the newly-constructed shrine, Simonides would situate that abduction, the act that linked the Athenians to the god, at the place where the Athenians established the shrine to the god.[81] The reading "Ilissus" would be more suitable for a poem composed for performance at the shrine, but it is difficult to account for the intrusion of the element "Br-," especially when the resulting location is unknown. That later accounts tend to place the abduction at Ilissus suggests that something, such as the dedication of the shrine that would serve as a physical reminder of the myth, served to fix the location of the abduction.[82] The reading "Ilissus" could be the result of the shrine having been established there, making "Brilissus," the *lectio difficilior*, preferable; Brilissus could then be emended to Brilessus.[83]

---

[78] Page prints both variants, favouring Κεῖαν (*PMG* 535); Molyneux' translation implies his acceptance of οἰκείαν (1992, 159).

[79] See n.69.

[80] Naeke's emendation is cited by Molyneux 1992, 160.

[81] Molyneux 1992, 160-1.

Equally debated is the date of the performance of the ode. If we accept the theory that the ode was commissioned for the foundation of the shrine, the date of the foundation of the shrine provides a *terminus post quem* (or *quo cum).* Herodotus notes only that the Athenians established the shrine upon their return to Athens (7.189.3). Wilamowitz proposed a date in 479 shortly after the battle of Salamis.[84] Nevertheless, as Molyneux noted, the Athenians had other, more pressing, concerns to deal with immediately upon their return to Athens following their defeat of the Persians: "confronted by the ruins of their city, tempted by Mardonius, and abandoned (as they felt) by their allies, [they] are not likely to have had either the time or the inclination for festivities."[85] Furthermore, they would have lacked the financial, material, and human resources necessary to establish the shrine to Boreas, regardless of their desire. The most likely date for the performance of the ode would then be sometime after 478, when the Athenians had the time and resources necessary to establish the shrine. If so, the date and the shrine's location imply both a temporal and a spatial distance from the events narrated in the ode. Rather than a lament for the fallen of Artemisium, the ode could perhaps be seen as an ode of celebration of the victory and thanksgiving to the gods; Simonides would be unlikely to be so churlish as to mention all those who died at Artemisium in an ode performed at Boreas' shrine and likely celebrating Boreas' help in securing the victory; the intervening year could make lamentation of the dead less necessary.

---

[82] Wilamowitz 1913, 207. Ilissus is the location of the rape in the later accounts of Plato (*Phaedrus* 229b-d), Apollonius of Rhodes (*Argonautica* 1.211-7), and Pausanias (1.19.5). Choerilus, however, locates the rape at Cephissus (*SH* 321); see page 172.

[83] Molyneux 1992, 160.

[84] Wilamowitz 1913, 207.

Another possibility for the first performance of the ode would be the Panathenaic festival, the location implied by Himerius (*Or.* 47.14).[86] The Panathenaic festival would be a fitting spot for an ode to the Athenians' son-in-law; the context would allow them to express their thanks to the god, and reaffirm their kinship with him. Bowra argues for the Panathenaic festival, stating that Athens' revival of the Panathenaea following the end of their exile and their return to Athens would be an appropriate place for a hymn celebrating the Athenians' victory.[87] Although I reject Bowra's identification of the ode as Simonides' elegy on Salamis, it is not necessary to reject his theory regarding the place of performance. The Athenians viewed Artemisium, like Salamis, as a significant Athenian victory, the celebration of which was an appropriate topic for the civic festival. If the ode was performed at the Panathenaea, again it is more likely to have focused on the triumph rather than on the dead: the glory of Athens is not best celebrated by publicly focusing on their military losses. It is, however, impossible to be certain.

Having determined that Simonides wrote an elegy on the battle of Artemisium for the Athenians, we are able to sketch, albeit in very broad strokes, Simonides' likely treatment of the subject. From the fragments, we can infer that Simonides narrated the actions on both the divine plane, such as the role of Boreas and the reasons for his help, and the mortal plane, such as the naval battle itself. The poem was likely commissioned by the Athenians; if performed after 478, we can infer that the poem contained little

---

[85] Molyneux 1992, 163.

[86] Himerius' oration is entitled "to Basileius, at the Panathenaea" and alludes to the ship towed in the Panathenaic festival (Molyneux 1992, 170 n.55).

lamentation for the dead and consolation of the living. Similarly, if intended for performance at the shrine or at the Panathenaea, then it is likely that there would be little lamentation for the dead. We can also conclude that the celebrations of the battle of Artemisium were of interest to the Athenians. Like Pindar, Simonides may have worked to cast the outcome of the battle into a more favourable light.

III: THE *BATTLE OF SALAMIS*

Simonides also composed a poem on the battle of Salamis (*Suda* s.v. Σιμωνίδης; Plut., *Vit. Them.* 15.4). As was the case with the Artemisium poem, the issue of the metre of the Salamis poem is questionable. Although the *Suda* was correct in its identification of the Artemisium ode as elegiac, the publication of elegiac fragments that suggest the battle of Salamis (*POxy*. 2327 fr. 31) has called into question the *Suda*'s identification of the Salamis poem as lyric. While it is, of course, possible that Simonides composed more than one poem, in different metres, on Salamis, it must, however, be noted that the fragments in *POxy*. 2327 are identified as Simonides simply because there are known Simonidean fragments in the same hand.[88] We cannot be certain that these fragments are Simonides. Nevertheless, they do suggest a narrative of the Persian Wars. I will, therefore, examine them here, without necessarily accepting their attribution to Simonides.

POxy. 2327 fr. 31 (=7 *IEG*^{2}) contains nine mostly complete words including "Phrygians," "Phoenicians," and perhaps "children of the Medes" (παισὶν Μή[δων) although the supplement is not certain. The words do appear in what might be a naval

---

[87] Bowra 1961, 344.

context (suggested by the mention of ποντοβόαι, "naval cries"). On this basis, the topic is tentatively identified as the Persian Wars. The restoration σάλ]πιγγος in the fourth line has been used to narrow the identification to the battle of Salamis rather than that of Artemisium: Aeschylus records that a trumpet (σάλπιγξ) announced the beginning of the battle of Salamis (*Persae* 395).[89] The detail of the battle beginning with a trumpet blast need not, however, rule out Artemisium as the subject of the poem. The ships at Artemisium equally needed a signal to know when to commence the attack, since the naval manouevres they executed required that all squadrons be synchronized. In his description of the battle of Artemisium, Herodotus records the use of a signal but not its nature (8. 11.1).[90] We can, however, infer that the signal to start the manouevres was an audible one rather than visual. A fire signal would be less effective in daylight since there would be no immediate and dramatic contrast between light and darkness to grab the attention of the combatants. A loud noise, however, requires no such contrast and so would be instantly recognizable and more readily acted upon by all ships in concert, as required by the coordinated attack; the fact that a trumpet was used at Salamis for just such a purpose may suggest that it was a regular tool and so also used at Artemisium. This calls into question the use of σάλ]πιγγος to ascribe *POxy.* 2327 fr. 31 to Simonides' Salamis poem.

---

[88] Lobel 1954, 67.

[89] If the battle is that of Salamis, that both Simonides and Aeschylus recorded the blast of the trumpet does not necessarily indicate that the tragedian based his account on that of Simonides, as Podlecki suggests (1968, 268). Aeschylus' age makes it likely that he fought at Salamis, in which case his account could be based on his own experiences in the battle. While he would have had first-hand knowledge only of his area of the battlefield rather than of all aspects of the battle, presumably the trumpet blast that signaled the beginning of the battle would have been audible to all of the combatants.

[90] Herodotus mentions two separate signals, the first for the ships to get into battle formation and the second to commence the attack (8.11.1).

We do, however, have stronger evidence for Simonides' poem on Salamis. In his account of the battle of Salamis (*Vit. Them.* 13-15.4), Plutarch records that the two sides fought until evening before the Greek fleet won and cites Simonides as his source (ὥσπερ εἴρηκε Σιμωνίδης). The extent to which Plutarch quoted or paraphrased Simonides is debated: M. Boas regarded virtually the entire passage as either direct quotation or at least close paraphrase of Simonides' poem; Podlecki identifies only a few words and phrases which, because of their suitability to an elegiac metre, may be quotations or close paraphrase; while West prints the entire text as Plutarch's prose.[91] Molyneux too sees the passage as "pure prose" but argues that, since there would have been no reason to cite Simonides simply to indicate the time of the battle, the passage must be a close paraphrase of the poet.[92] While we cannot securely identify any new fragment of Simonides' poem on Salamis, we can nonetheless conclude that he did write an ode celebrating that victory, narrating the events of the battle. Such an ode would most likely have been composed for Athens since Salamis was essentially "their" victory. We can therefore add Simonides' ode on Salamis to the plays of Aeschylus and Phrynichus which featured that battle prominently, Timotheus' *nomos* and, perhaps, Choerilus' *Persica*. This allows us to conclude that Salamis enjoyed poetic prominence in Athens.

---

[91] M. Boas, *De Epigrammatis Simonideis, Pars Prior: Commentatio Critica de Epigrammatum Traditione* (Groningen, 1905); Podlecki 1968, 267; West, Simonides 5 *IEG*^{2}.

[92] Molyneux 1992, 188-9.

IV: THE *BATTLE OF PLATAEA* (FRR. 10-17 [18?] *IEG*^{2})[93]

Thanks to a remarkable discovery at Oxyrhynchus, we now have a substantial piece of one of Simonides' narrative elegies, which provides us with important and interesting information about his approach to the Persian Wars. It is the longest and the most complete of the surviving fragments of Simonides' poetry; it is also the only extant poetic text taking the battle of Plataea as a topic. What is especially interesting about this fragment is what we can glean of Simonides' purpose in writing. Boedeker argues that the poem "explicitly seeks to *establish* the fame of its subjects [emphasis in original]."[94] This points to the use of poetry to confer fame and ensure knowledge about a topic. It is therefore unfortunate that the poem is not complete and that what survives is very lacunose. Nevertheless the text can tell us, in general terms, what elements of the battle of Plataea and the Persian Wars were mentioned although not precisely how these elements were handled.

While it is impossible to know how much of the poem is missing and so what events were included, there is some evidence to help estimate the extent of the loss. The fragment begins with remnants of what is likely a proem, which occurs most naturally at the beginning of a poem. We can therefore infer that we are only missing one section, of indeterminate length, from the opening of the poem. This is supported by Parsons' examination of the fragments, which identifies them as coming from a professionally-made book. This allows him to estimate cautiously that at least one column, or approximately thirty lines, is missing.[95] We cannot, of course, know the full extent of the loss.

---

[93] I here adopt the title *Battle of Plataea* on analogy with the titles preserved in the *Suda*.

[94] D. Boedeker, "Paths to Heroization at Plataea," in Boedeker and Sider 2001, 154. In support, Boedeker cites fr. 11.21-5 *IEG*^{2}, where Simonides calls upon the Muse to assist him in ensuring that the fame of those who fought at Plataea will not be diminished.

The content of the preserved fragment, which suggests the preliminaries to the battle of Plataea, also suggests that we are missing only a section of the beginning of the battle narrative as well as the end of the elegy; it also enables us to determine the topic of the poem. That the topic of the elegy includes Plataea is guaranteed by the reference to the army marching forth from Sparta under the leadership of Pausanias, the commander of the Spartan forces at Plataea: κα[ι Σπάρτη]ς ἄστυ λιπόντ[ες (fr. 11.29 *IEG*^{2}; compare Hdt. 9.10). The line has been restored and the name of the city is lost. Nevertheless, "Sparta" is virtually guaranteed by its metrical suitability, the subsequent mention of Pausanias, the Spartan King, and the Spartan heroes, Menelaus and the Tyndarids (identified periphrastically as "the horse-subduing sons of Zeus," with their names possibly appearing in the following lacuna [fr. 11.30-1*IEG*^{2}]), and by the earlier mention of Sparta (fr. 11.25 *IEG*^{2}). The prominence of Sparta in the opening lines suggests Sparta as the target audience.

It is, however, possible that the preserved proem is an internal proem marking a transition to a new topic or section, rather than an initial one marking the start of a poem. If so, then the section narrating the battle of Plataea would occur not at the beginning of a poem dedicated to that battle but rather as one section in a larger poem narrating the Spartan contribution to the Persian Wars or else to a narrative of the Persian Wars as a whole. The content of the proem, however, argues against this.

---

[95] Parsons 1992, 33.

The proem contains an address to an individual and a mention of a death and burial (fr. 11.1-20 *IEG*^{2}). The subject has been identified as Achilles, whose name appears nowhere in the text, but has been inferred from fragmentary words and the reconstructed context. In line 10, Πρ]ιάμου παισὶ "son of Priam," appears, followed by 'Αλεξά]νδροιο "Alexander" in line 11 and Δαναοί, "Danaans" in line 14. These combine to suggest the Trojan War. A reference to ἀθά]ν̣ατον...κλέος, "deathless fame" further supports this identification as does the reference to Homer, the poet who immortalized the deathless fame of the Heroes (15-18). From these references, we can infer that the addressee is a hero who died during the Trojan War. Although many heroes died during the Trojan War, the subsequent mention in lines 19-20 of θεᾶς, "goddess" and Νηρέος, "Nereus" serves to narrow the field. The words suggest Nereus' daughter, the goddess Thetis, which in turn suggests Achilles, her son, the Best of the Achaeans, and the focal point of the *Iliad*, as the addressee of Simonides' proem.

The proem and its figure of Achilles are helpful to our understanding of the scope and intent of Simonides' elegy. Simonides addresses Achilles not as a mortal, but rather as a semi-divine hero, one who enjoys a special status after death; he indicates this with his use of the salutation of leave-taking χαῖρε as he pivots from his address to Achilles to begin the poem proper. Sourvinou-Inwood, having studied archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic epitaphs, concludes that until the fourth century χαῖρε was reserved for deities and for those dead "who had achieved heroic or divine status in the afterlife."[96] In this way, Achilles is endowed with a dual immortality—immortality through fame and immortality through cult.

Carlo Pavese has argued that the elegy also included Thermopylae, seeing a parallel between Achilles, whose death is avenged by the fall of Troy, and Leonidas, whose death at Thermopylae is avenged by the victory at Plataea and the final rout of the Persians.[97] Although the summoning of the Muse suggests we have the start of the narrative, and so no place for Thermopylae, this is not certain. It is possible to invoke the Muse again during the course of a poem (e.g., *Il.* 2.484-93, 14.595-7, 16.135-7). Later invocations generally mark "the transition to a different type of poetry/discourse."[98] This would allow Simonides to narrate the battle of Thermopylae in the missing section of the poem, call upon the Muse, and then turn to narrate a new section, namely the battle of Plataea. Nevertheless, certain considerations argue against this.

Pavese's support for the inclusion of Thermopylae rests on the suitability of Achilles as a parallel for Leonidas. As we shall see, however, Achilles is better read not as a parallel for the hypothetical Leonidas but for Pausanias and all those who fought at Plataea. Simonides mentions the death of Achilles and the fame the *hemitheoi Danaoi* earned through the poetry of Homer; he then summons the Muse and so allies himself with Homer.[99] This suggests that Simonides sees himself as belonging to the Homeric tradition: conferring fame on the valourous through poetry.[100] This further suggests that Achilles should be read not as a parallel for what might have gone before (i.e.,

---

[96] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 199; for her analysis of the evidence, see pages 180-210. For this reading of χαῖρε, see Boedeker 2001a, 157, and Obbink 2001, 69 (who notes its use as a form of transition in hymns).

[97] C.O. Pavese, "Elegia di Simonide agli Spartiati per Platea," *ZPE* 107 (1995): 22.

[98] Obbink 2001, 71 (=Obbink 1996, 199).

[99] See also Stehle 2001 on this issue.

[100] Deborah Boedeker, "Heroizing History: Simonides' Elegy on Plataea," ms (=J. Papademetriou, *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference [May 1994] of the Hellenic Society for Humanistic Studies* [Athens, 1995]); compare Boedeker, "The New Simonides and Heroization at Plataia," in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, eds. Nick Fisher and Hans van Wees (London: Duckworth, 1998), 231-49. This article has now been superseded by Boedeker 2001b.

Thermopylae), but for what comes after (i.e., Plataea). The emphasis is not on his death, but rather on his subsequent fame: just as Homer ensured the undying fame of Achilles, Simonides will ensure that of the Spartans.[101]

From his address to Achilles, Simonides pivots (αὐτὰρ ἐγώ, "But I") to the narrative proper.[102] There, he summons the Muse to assist him in commemorating the deeds of the Spartans, who deserve fame because of their activities at Plataea. The victory at Plataea will not simply avenge the death of those who fought at Thermopylae, as Pavese argues, but rather, through subsequent song, ensure that those who fought at Plataea are remembered for their deeds. Simonides then puts that into practice through the course of his song.

The prominence given in the proem to Achilles' death and his semi-divine status, indicated by the salutation χαῖρε, and the seeming transition from a hymn to the narrative proper, may indicate the date and place of the ode's first performance. The presence of Achilles in particular has been used to pinpoint the location, with scholars seeking locations where a hymn to a semi-divine Achilles would be appropriate. As Antonio Aloni and Deborah Boedeker convincingly demonstrate, such a location can be found in a funeral for those who fell at Plataea.[103]

The elegy does contain an element of mourning which would be suitable for the context of a funeral for the dead. It is, however, mourning which offers comfort to the family and city of the dead and a solution to their grief. The element of mourning is contained within the figure of Achilles, who is addressed not simply as one of the dead but rather as one of the heroized dead. Just as Achilles achieved great fame through poetry because of his death at Troy, so too will those who fell at Plataea receive great fame through poetry for their own deaths at Plataea. The knowledge that the dead are not truly dead, but can enjoy a symbolic immortality through *kleos*, diminishes their loss.

---

[101] Rutherford 2001, 38.

[102] Obbink 2001, 67-73.

[103] Aloni 2001, 95-104; Boedeker 2001a, 148-63.

V: *FOR THE DEAD OF THERMOPYLAE*

> τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων
> εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἁ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος,
> βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, ὁ δ' οἶκτος ἔπαινος·
> ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς
> οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος.
> ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅδε σηκὸς οἰκέταν εὐδοξίαν
> Ἑλλάδος εἵλετο· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας,
> Σπάρτας βασιλεύς, ἀρετᾶς μέγαν λελοιπὼς
> κόσμον ἀέναόν τε κλέος
>
> The fortune of those who died at Thermopylae is famous, their fate is fair, their tomb is an altar, in place of lamentation there is remembrance, pity is their praise;[104] neither decay nor all-subduing time will diminish this funeral shroud. This precinct of excellent men has the good report of Greece as its servant; Leonidas, the king of Sparta, who left behind a great ornament of valour and undying fame, bears witness (*PMG* 531).

It remains to consider Simonides' poem dealing not with a victory, but rather a defeat. The preserved text does not mention the battle of Thermopylae, but rather celebrates those who died fighting it and ensures their future glory and fame. In the ode, Simonides transforms the military defeat of the Spartans into a moral victory for Spartan values and ideology: the dead are praised for their courage and virtue, while the cause of their death is downplayed. In honour of their valour, they, like Leonidas, receive fame.

Diodorus preserves the text, having embedded the fragment within his discussion of the battle of Thermopylae (11.6.3-12.1); he identifies the poem from which it came as an encomium by Simonides justified by the valour of the fallen (Σιμωνίδης ὁ μελοποιὸς ἄξιον τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἐγκώμιον). The *communis opinio* is that the poem is a fragment of a larger poem, specifically commissioned by the Spartans, and intended as a memorial for those who died at Thermopylae. Although the poem is not mentioned in the *Suda*'s catalogue of titles of Simonides' poems, this ought not to be taken as evidence against Simonidean authorship. There is no reason to believe that the *Suda*'s catalogue is exhaustive, making its absence unimportant; on the other hand, the poem may be subsumed under the list of genres in which Simonides wrote.

---

[104] I translate οἶκτος as "pity" rather than "lamentation" since, in the preceding clause, Simonides denied that there was lamentation for the dead. M.J. Cropp has suggested to me that a preferable translation of the phrase is "instead of a lament (i.e., a formal *threnos*), they receive an *epainos* (praise poem). This is an interesting and likely possibility, which I will explore in the future.

Diodorus' identification of the poem as an encomium has caused some debate as to the genre of the poem. H.W. Smyth leans towards identifying it as a threnody and with this A.E. Harvey concurs; Smyth does, however, express some reservations about this identification since "the poet's intention [is] to praise their heroism rather than bewail their death."[105] Nevertheless, later scholarly definitions of the *threnos* include "a lament for the dead which contains praise, sung before or after burial or on the various occasions for mourning at the tomb."[106] We ought therefore to accept the explicit text of Diodorus and its identification of the text as a fragment of an encomium, in honour of those who died at Thermopylae.

D.L. Steiner, stating that an encomium is "something 'properly' delivered in praise of living men" argues, "Simonides' words may have been embedded within a composition as much designed for the purpose of praising, exhorting and inspiring the living as for memorializing the dead."[107] This is unnecessary, however. Smyth defines the encomium as "a laudatory poem of a dignified character in honour of men." Although he notes that, in its restricted sense, the encomium is in honour of living men, he points out that the term had a wider sense that encompassed not only songs in honour of living men, but also "the *threnos* or panegyric of the dead."[108]

---

[105] W.H. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* (London: MacMillan 1906), lxxix; A.E. Harvey, "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry," *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955): 163 n.6.

[106] Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 226 n.7.

Furthermore, the context in Diodorus argues against Steiner's theory that the poem included the Thermopylae dead simply as an exemplum for the different group whom the poem honoured. At 11.6.3, Diodorus began to discuss the events of Thermopylae and the dead at length, offering his own encomium of the dead at 11.11.1-5. He notes that the Thermopylae dead and their valour were the topic not only for historians but also for poets (οὐχ τῶν ἱστοριῶν...μόνοι ἀλλὰ πολλαὶ καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν). He follows this with the statement that Simonides wrote an encomium worthy of their valour (ἄξιον τῆς ἀρετῆς αὐτῶν ποιήσας ἐγκώμιον), and then quotes the fragment. This implies that Diodorus conceived of Simonides' poem as having been composed in honour of the Thermopylean dead. Finally, Diodorus ends at 11.12.1 with the statement ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀρκούντως περὶ τῆς τούτων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀρετῆς εἰρηκότες ἐπάνιμεν ἐπὶ τὰ συνεχῆ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, "having spoken about the valour of these men sufficiently, we will return to the course of our discussion," and resumes his history of the Persian Wars. Diodorus' lengthy discussion of the Persian Wars in general and Thermopylae in particular implies that the lines quoted were in honour of the Thermopylae dead, rather than that the Thermopylae dead served as an exemplum for some other group in whose honour the poem was written. There is no hint in Diodorus of any other group who could have been honoured by reference to the dead of Thermopylae.[109]

---

[107] Steiner 1999, 383.

Turning to the text of the fragment, we can now consider how Simonides approached his task of praising the massacred Spartans. The reading of the text has been called into question. M. L. West rejects the phrase τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων, "those who died at Thermopylae," as forming part of the quotation from Simonides, because "stylistically the articled participle with the sandwiched prepositional phrase is abhorrent in a fifth-century lyric poem" and because "Simonides would not have needed to specify so bluntly whom he was talking about."[110] Instead, West asserts that the phrase is Diodorus' identification of the subject, or else an intrusive gloss on the part of a later scribe and so is to be excised from the Simonidean text. West returns to this issue in a later article and adds that the mention of Leonidas in line 7 as a witness to what the poem has asserted in the preceding lines means that lines 2-7 are "general statements, not referring to particular men, or at any rate not to men connected with Leonidas."[111] West's statements are assertions, lack supporting evidence, and are convincingly refuted by D.L. Page. Page offers parallels for the "articled participle with the sandwiched prepositional phrase" and argues that our ignorance of the circumstances in which the poem was performed and of the entire text of the poem means that we cannot summarily decide what Simonides would and would not have needed to specify. We ought not, therefore, so

---

[108] Smyth 1906, lxxvi-lxxvii.

[109] For these same reasons, we can reject Kegel's suggestion that the poem was in honour of Leonidas specifically, since "Diodorus does *not* say that it is an encomium *on* the soldiers of Thermopylae, but an encomium which does justice to their courage" (Kegel 1962, 34-7 [paraphrase and quotation in Gerber 1970, 315; emphasis in original]).

[110] M.L. West, "Prose in Simonides," *CQ* 17 (1967): 133.

[111] M.L. West, "Melica," *CQ* 20 (1970): 210.

readily reject the mention of the Thermopylean dead. Page also notes that the line scans and fits metrically with the remaining text.[112] Furthermore, Hugh Lloyd-Jones points out that were the line prose, ἀποθανόντων would be expected in place of θανόντων since "considerations of verbal aspect require the insertion of the preverb."[113] I therefore retain the line τῶν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις θανόντων, "those who died at Thermopylae" as part of Simonides' poem.

The poem's third line is crucial to our understanding of Simonides' approach. Bowra translates the line "for a tomb they have an altar, for lamentation they have remembrance, for pity, praise" and his translation has been widely accepted.[114] This translation is unlikely, however. Bowra states that the phrase βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, mean not that 'their tomb is an altar' but 'instead of a tomb they have an altar', and is parallel to ὁ δ' οἶκτος ἔπαινος, which means not 'pity for them is praise', but 'instead of pity they have praise.'"[115] Bowra does not explain his reasoning, but it would appear that he is influenced by the central phrase πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, "in place of lamentation, [there is] remembrance" and thus extends the substitution expressed by πρό in the middle phrase back onto the one that precedes it and forward onto the one that follows. The substitution of one element for another, however, is expressed only in the central phrase. The first and third elements are straightforward subjects (articled nouns) together with predicate nominatives and ought to be translated as such: "their grave is an altar...pity is their praise." Bowra's translation ignores the common subject/predicate pair and requires the audience to translate an immediately intelligible subject/predicate noun combination (βωμὸς δ' ὁ τάφος, "their tomb is an altar") in light of something they have not yet heard (πρὸ γόων δὲ μνᾶστις, "in place of lamentation, they have praise"). Indeed, the audience had already heard two comparable subject/predicate adjective pairs in the second line (εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἁ τύχα, καλὸς δ' ὁ πότμος, "their fortune has great fame, their fate is fair"); most naturally then they would understand the following phrase as a similar subject and predicate. While Bowra's shifting of the middle phrase back onto the first phrase is possible for later audiences who can read the entire text and determine the meaning of any one part based on the significance of the whole, such a reading would require too great a mental shift for an audience hearing the poem for the first time.

---

[112] D.L. Page, "Poetry and Prose: Simonides, *P.M.G.* 531, Ibycus 298," *CR* n.s. 21 (1971): 317-8.

[113] Hugh Lloyd-Jones, "Simonides *PMG* 531," *CR* n.s. 24 (1974): 1.

[114] C.M. Bowra, "Simonides on the Fallen of Thermopylae," *CP* 28 (1933): 279 and Bowra 1961, 346. Bowra is followed by David A. Campbell (*Greek Lyric Poetry* [London: MacMillan, 1967; reprint, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1982], 384), Molyneux (1992, 185), and D. Steiner ("To Praise, not to Bury: Simonides fr. 531P," *CQ* 49 [1999]: 386). M.A. Flower follows Bowra in his translation of the third element ("for pity [they have] praise"), but not in the first, preferring "their tomb is an altar" ("Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the battle of Thermopylae," *CQ* 48 [1998]: 369).

τὸ ἐντάφιον is a funeral shroud,[116] or winding sheet; in the plural, it can mean "funerary offerings" or "rites." Bowra rejects the straightforward translation of "funeral shroud," stating "but this is surely a little strained, as the shroud is not an image which suggests all that Simonides had in mind."[117] Bowra objects further, stating "if Simonides uses ἐντάφιον in the sense of 'shroud' he must mean that the memory of the dead is like an everlasting shroud, and the image, though violent, is not very appropriate. In what

---

[115] Bowra 1961, 347; see also Bowra 1933, 279.

[116] ἐντάφιον is a relatively uncommon word; *LSJ* cite only a handful of instances of it. Its rareness has led G. Burzacchini to argue that *PMG* 594, ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς, "finally s/he has gone beneath the ground" is another fragment from Simonides' Thermopylae poem. Plutarch mentions ἐντάφιον and then quotes the line from Simonides (*an seni. resp. ger.*). This combination leads Burzacchini to see thematic, but not verbal, parallels between *PMG* 531 and Plutarch's discussion: an indestructible funeral shroud is a reward; there is emphasis on obedience to the state; and glory is a reward upon death ("ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς (=Simon. 89P," *QUCC* 25 [1977]: 31-41). V. Citti concurs ("Il lenzuolo funebre della tirannide. A proposito di Simon. 89P," *Prometheus* 13 [1987]: 11-12.

[117] Bowra 1961, 348.

sense is this remembrance like a shroud? What is there to hide or cover?".[118] Instead, Bowra proposes reading the singular as a plural, and translating it as "offerings to the dead" or "funeral rites." His translation has been influential, but it is not certain.[119] There are numerous, albeit later, parallels for ἐντάφιον as "funeral shroud" (e.g., Isocr. 6.44; Polybius 15.10.3). Bowra, however, can offer no parallel for his reading except for one that he himself concedes is by no means certain.[120] He offers the comment of a scholiast who, at Sophocles' *Electra* 326, glosses ἐντάφια with ἐναγίσματα. In the singular, ἐναγίσμα does mean "offering" which suggests to Bowra that ἐντάφιον can also share this meaning. There is, however, no secure evidence to support this; the word ἐντάφιον first occurs in Simonides and is not found again until Sophocles' *Electra*. While it is possible that the meaning of ἐντάφιον was not fixed during the time of Sophocles, and so could have shared the plural meaning of ἐναγίσμα as the scholiast to Sophocles suggests, we cannot be sure.

Finally, the effect of Bowra's objection to the violent image in which memory is likened to the physical shroud in which the dead are wrapped can be minimized. His linking of "cover" with "hide" suggests that he sees the function of the funeral shroud is to conceal the deceased from view. I suggest instead that the shroud covering the deceased may be a form of protection for the deceased, protecting him not physically, from the grave but rather symbolically, from oblivion: the memory of the living, which acts as the shroud, will prevent the glory of the dead from fading.

---

[118] Bowra 1933, 280.

[119] Campbell 1982, 384 translates the term as "funeral offerings," stating that the meaning "fits the present passage well." Bowra's translation is accepted by W.J.H.F. Kegel, *Simonides* (J.B. Wolters: Groningen, 1962), 92 [English summary of Chapter 3]), and Molyneux, who notes the controversy but declines to discuss it (1992, 185 and 205 n.41). Flower (1998, 369) and Steiner (1999, 387) remain neutral.

[120] Bowra 1961, 348.

Finally, the shroud is described as τοιοῦτον ἐντάφιον. The adjective τοιοῦτον points backwards, linking the shroud with something that had just been discussed. That there is no mention of "funeral rites" in the preceding lines means that τοιοῦτον cannot refer to them. Instead, τοιοῦτον will have pointed back either to the praise (ἔπαινος) just mentioned, or to the sentiment of the whole sentence (εὐκλεὴς μὲν ἁ τύχα κ.τ.λ, "their fortune has great fame, etc.") which promises a symbolic immortality for the dead.[121] The translation "funeral shroud" therefore does fit the passage well: the Thermopylae dead have a shroud that, like their glory, will never fade or become obscure.

The glory of Greece (εὐδοξίαν Ἑλλάδος), won by the dead, is said to be the οἰκέταν of the dead. Bowra translates οἰκέταν, incorrectly, as "household spirit" and envisions it as a protecting divinity who will look after the shrine of the Thermopylean dead.[122] In support of this reading, he notes the cult-title Karneios [B]oiketas, which signifies 'god of the household.'[123] From this, Bowra argues that "[i]t follows that when Glory is οἰκέτας of the shrine, she is a protecting divinity and will look after it."[124] We cannot, however, explain away the simple and oft-attested term "household slave" with reference to an obscure epithet associated with Apollo, in particular since in the context of the poem, "household slave" or "attendant" makes ample sense.[125] The glory of Greece, that is to say their fame throughout Greece that the dead earned by their valour, will tend the dead and ensure that their memory never fades.

---

[121] Podlecki rightly rejects Bowra's translation "funeral rites" in favour of "funeral shroud," noting that there are no parallels for Bowra's translation and that such a translation would spoil the sense of the passage (1968, 261). Podlecki's reading is adopted by Gerber 1970, 317. Compare Enzo Degani and Gabriele Burzacchini, *Lirici Greci Antologia* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1977), 320.

[122] In his earlier article, Bowra rejected the possibility that personified Glory of Hellas could dwell in the shrine as a protecting deity since there are no parallels for this use of οἰκέταν ; instead, he stated, "the natural meaning is that Glory is an attendant at the shrine" (1933, 280). Bowra later revised his position, rejecting the interpretation of Glory as attendant, and advancing Glory as the protecting deity of the shrine (1961, 349). Bowra's later interpretation is followed by Molyneux in his translation; Molyneux again notes the controversy but declines to comment (1992, 205 n.41).

[123] Both Karneios Oiketas and Karneios Boiketas appear in inscriptions (*IG* v.i.497; 589; 608). Pausanias mentions Karneios Oiketas as an early god worshipped in Sparta (3.13.4); Irad Malkin sees Karneios Oiketas as an early forerunner for Apollo Karneios and traces the significance of the god to Spartan colonization (*Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994], 143-58). For a general outline of Karneios Oiketas, see Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 236.

[124] Bowra 1961, 349.

Having rejected Bowra's influential reading, what can we put in its place? What do the lines "the grave [of the Thermopylean dead] is an altar, there is remembrance in place of lamentation, pity is their praise" signify? I suggest that Simonides offers as consolation to the living the knowledge that the dead are not truly gone, but instead will live on symbolically in the memory of the living; this posthumous fame is made possible by Simonides' ode. The poem is as much a treatise on the power of poetry to confer fame as it is a commemoration of the dead at Thermopylae and it is in this context that the imagery of the poem must be read. I suggest that the reference to ὅδε σηκός is not to a literal tomb, or a metaphorical heroön, but perhaps a reference to the poem itself.[126]

It can be objected, however, that there is nothing in the surviving text to demand this interpretation. Although the Thermopylean dead are specified, there is no mention made of how they died, or of what they accomplished. These are two elements that could be considered crucial to a poem specifically commissioned to memorialize the accomplishments of the Thermopylean dead. Nevertheless, the uniqueness of the battle of Thermopylae makes these very elements unwelcome: Thermopylae was not a victory but rather a disastrous defeat. A poet, praising the dead, cannot mention that the Persians massacred them to a man and then advanced further into the Greek mainland. Similarly, the combatants accomplished very little at Thermopylae: although they delayed briefly the Persian land advance, they did not prevent it. Instead, it is incumbent upon the poet praising the battle of Thermopylae and those who fought and died there to recast the defeat, absolving the dead of shame. This Simonides does by turning it into a moral victory, one indicative of the courage and valour of the Spartans, and one which points to the Spartans' perception of themselves and their role in the Persian Wars: even in defeat, Spartan martial ideology prevails.

---

[125] So Podlecki 1968, 261, Gerber 1970, 317, West 1970, 211 and n.2, and Degani and Burzacchini 1977, 321. Flower translates the term as "inhabitant" (1998, 369); compare Campbell who sees the Glory of Greece as the "holy inmate of the shrine" (1982, 384).

Turning to the date and place of performance, we find that Bowra argues that the explicit mention of Thermopylae means that the poem could not have been performed at Thermopylae; his theory has found much favour.[127] Molyneux, however, disagrees, arguing, "if the lines are intended as a permanent tribute to the dead, the site of the battle would naturally be specified, even if the poem was originally performed there."[128] To Molyneux' arguments we can add the possibility that the reference to Thermopylae signifies not the physical location of Thermopylae, but rather the battle which had been fought there. On analogy with *Marathonomachoi*, the phrase "those who died at Thermopylae" may have designated the group and their accomplishments rather than the place. As such, the place of the battle would naturally be specified in a poem commemorating their valour and sacrifice. They are honoured not as generic Spartan

---

[126] For the metaphorical heroon, see West 1970, 210-1 and Podlecki 1968, 260; for the literal tomb, see Page 1971, 318 and Molyneux 1992, 186.

[127] Bowra 1961, 346-7. Campbell (1982, 384), Podlecki (1968, 259), Gerber (1970, 316) and (Steiner 1990, 383-4) accept Bowra's argument.

[128] Molyneux 1992, 186.

dead, but specifically as those who fell at Thermopylae, having willingly faced certain death rather than retreat in ignominy.[129]

External evidence suggests that if the ode were first performed at Thermopylae, the earliest possible date would be after 479; prior to that, the Persians held Thermopylae. If the ode were performed at Sparta, a date after 480 is possible. It might be argued that the internal evidence can help us to establish the date of the ode. First, Simonides cites Leonidas as witness to the fame of the fallen (μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Λεωνίδας), with Leonidas' own reputation taken to confirm that the dead too will enjoy a lasting fame earned by their deeds.[130] The explicit mention of Leonidas' fame could be read as an indication of a late date for the performance of the ode: i.e., a date far enough removed from the battle of Thermopylae to permit the reputation that Leonidas earned there to grow sufficiently to stand as surety for the fame of the dead of Thermopylae. That Leonidas' bones were returned to Sparta and ceremoniously re-buried in 440 may suggest a date for this poem. Presumably, such a ceremony would be a fitting occasion for poetry celebrating not only the accomplishments of Leonidas at his heroic last stand, but also the accomplishments of those who died there with him, and for celebrating the fame that he, and his army, earned there. Furthermore, the mention of fame as an attendant of the graveside of the Thermopylean dead may presuppose that the dead have in fact acquired that fame. The existence of the dead's fame suggests that the poem was composed some time later than in the immediate aftermath of the battle, allowing sufficient time for the dead to acquire their fame to enable the poet to make reference to it.

---

[129] A popular Spartan maxim, albeit one found in late sources, demanded that soldiers return from battle "with [their] shield[s] or on it," i.e., victorious or having died honourably in battle. Compare the shame attendant upon Aristodemus, the sole Spartan survivor of Thermopylae: disgraced and shunned for cowardice (he was absent when the battle was fought), he died at Plataea only to be denied posthumous honour since he sought his death there, making his death not an act of courage but of suicide (Hdt. 7.229-31; 9.71-2).

[130] Campbell 1982, 384.

There are, however, certain considerations that argue against dating the poem to post 440. Simonides' mention of the fame of the dead may be an instance of art influencing and shaping life: by calling attention to the fame of the dead through his poem, Simonides in fact creates that very fame and establishes it as fact in the minds of the audience. Indeed, the content of the ode suggests that it is a treatise on the power of poetry to confer fame as much as a memorial to the dead. The mention of fame can be read as a literary *topos*, where the poet ensures the fame of the *laudandi* by referring to that very fame, whether realized or not, in effect creating fame by treating it as fact. Such a *topos* would us from dating the poem to a time when fame can be said to be flourishing. In this way, Simonides shares with Pindar an understanding of the power of poetry to confer fame, sometimes immediately the poem is sung.[131] Furthermore, the element of lamentation for the dead and consolation of the living within the poem argues for a date closer to the battle, when expressions of sorrow and mourning are expected. As well, Simonides is unlikely to have been alive and writing poetry in 440.[132]

We may, therefore, be able to suggest a date for the poem shortly after the battle itself or perhaps after the end of the Wars. As Molyneux observes, "[t]he Spartans, being exempt from the dangers confronting Athens, might reasonably be expected to build and dedicate a *sekos* in honour of their dead as soon as was practically possible."[133] An earlier date for the ode is indicated not only by the content of the ode, but also by the historical circumstances at Sparta.

---

[131] Compare Pindar *Pyth.* 5.73, where fame arises from the recent activity of the *laudandus* and Pindar's ode; we can also compare Simonides' on Plataea (see page 73-78).

[132] For the evidence for Simonides' lifespan, see page 49 and n.36

[133] Molyneux 1992, 187.

Finally, we must consider why Simonides would write an encomium of a defeat, and why the Spartans would have chosen to have a defeat commemorated. I suggest Simonides composed the poem in such a way as to redeem the dead and confer posthumous victory on them. In effect, Simonides snatches a social victory out of the jaws of a military defeat.[134]

For similar sentiments, we can compare the epigram for the Spartans at Thermopylae, often ascribed to Simonides: ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτε τῇδε κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων πειθόμενοι νομίμοις, "O stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here, obedient to their laws" (Hdt. 7.228.2; =*FGE* 22b). Although it seems unlikely that Simonides was the author, ultimately the question remains unresolvable.[135] The epigram does, however, share qualities with the lyric on Thermopylae. It too effaces the defeat and concentrates on the positive qualities demonstrated by the Spartans. Both emphasize Spartan ideology, in particular, willing death rather than cowardly retreat, and obedience to the state. Both deny the Persians any glory for their role in the deaths of the Spartans. In fact, so far from mentioning the Persians, the epigram refuses to mention even the battle, much less the Persians' victory over the Spartans. (It must, however, be noted that the epigram is not a narrative of the battle; nonetheless, it chooses to dwell on the heroism and dedication to duty of the Spartans rather than the cause of their deaths.)

---

[134] Here, we might usefully compare the official and popular response to the events of September 11, 2001. The dedication and courage of the rescue workers are lauded, deflecting attention from the attacks and the victims onto the rescue workers.

[135] Herodotus preserves the epigram together with two others. He assigns responsibility to the Amphictyones for the first two and explicitly ascribes the epigram for the seer Megistias to Simonides (7.228). Page rejects the ascription of the epigram in question to Simonides, pointing out that Simonides' role in composing the epigrams "is not merely not stated or implied; it is quite ruled out by the context" (*FGE* p. 231-2). Not everyone is convinced (e.g. Lazenby 1993, 148). For a concise discussion of the difficulty in determining which of the many epigrams ascribed to Simonides are genuine, see Robbins 1997, 251-2.

Both the epigram for the Spartans and Simonides' lyric ode to those who fell at Thermopylae reflect what becomes the standard reaction to the battle of Thermopylae: the dead are redeemed and become victorious in death, while the defeat itself and the Persians who caused it are effaced. This suggests that Simonides was instrumental in recasting the Spartan defeat as a victory. We might compare Diodorus, who quotes Simonides' ode and praises the Thermopylean dead for the way in which they knowingly and willingly faced their certain death, in obedience to Sparta's laws and the needs of the panhellenic alliance. In fact, so far from increasing the glory of the Persians, their role in the deaths of those at Thermopylae in fact diminishes them. The Spartans were not killed by the Persians but rather chose to die for the greater good of the alliance and Sparta. The Persians are mentioned only to highlight their awe in the face of the deeds of the Spartans. They and their astonishment serve as bookends for Diodorus' discussion of the events of Thermopylae (τὴν τῶν Περσῶν δὲ κατάπληξιν, "the amazement of the Persians" [11.11.2]; οἱ μὲν βάρβαροι κατεπλάγησαν, "the Barbarians were amazed" [11.11.]). In their deaths, the Thermopylean dead serve as an example for both Greeks and Persians alike (11.11.2-3).

CONCLUSIONS

As Bowie argued, there did exist lengthy narrative elegy on historical topics. These elegies differed from sympotic elegy in their topics that were civic and popular rather than of restricted interest to the aristocratic classes. It is in the tradition of these narrative historical elegies that we can place Simonides' elegies on the various battles of the Persian Wars. His poems served to ensure that the memory of great historical deeds was not forgotten.

Lamentation for the dead was prominent in those poems of Simonides that were composed for funeral or memorial services (i.e., the ode on Thermopylae). As we will see, the element of lamentation was restricted to Simonides' poems, performed on the occasion of funerals or memorials for the fallen; this element is absent in the poems by the later authors who focused on the victories rather than on the individuals who won them. Despite this element of lamentation, Simonides also attempted to stave off further lamentation as he offered consolation to the families and cities of the fallen. His poems were essentially praise poems, whether of the dead (e.g., Thermopylae) or of the victory and those who won it (e.g., Plataea). This function affected his approach to the topic as Simonides balanced the tasks of commemorating the deeds of the Greeks and preserving the memory of the dead.

We may also conclude that the battle of Artemisium received its share of praise at Athens. Simonides' ode on the battle of Artemisium was likely performed at Athens as was Pindar's dithyramb (frr. 76-7 Maehler), allowing us to conclude that the battle of Artemisium, while perhaps not as popular at Athens as was the victory at Salamis, was not ignored. It too received its meed of praise in the form of narrative poems.

Finally, it is unlikely that Simonides contributed to the development of the Persian as the Other, a culture diametrically opposed to the cohesive group of Athenians; for the origins of this development, we must look to the Athenian tragedians and, in particular, Aeschylus.

CHAPTER 2: TRAGEDY: (PHRYNICHUS AND AESCHYLUS)

Tragedies on events of recent history were not unknown and were composed during the Classical and Hellenistic ages. The evidence for historical tragedy demonstrates that, with few exceptions, these plays focused on Eastern matters, and primarily on the events of the Persian Wars. The first appearance of historical tragedies coincides with the blossoming of historical prose narratives. The impetus for Athenian interest in narratives of the recent past and the beginnings of interest in historical tragedy was the Persian Wars and in particular, the Athenian role in this watershed event. They recognized the significance of the Wars and their own role in them and were determined to commemorate and capitalize on it. Furthermore, in the fifth century the presence of the Persians—both actual and threatened— increased, resulting in a greater interest in the East on the part of the Greek world. In their treatments of the East, the tragic poets built on their predecessors, in particular Simonides. In this chapter, I will set historical tragedy in its social and literary context and explain why historical tragedies did not flourish. I will then consider the evidence for Phrynichus' two plays on the Persian Wars and their contribution to the theme, before turning to Aeschylus' treatment of the Wars in his *Persae*. This will enable me to determine the perception of the Persian Wars in tragedy and tragedy's role in shaping the public perception of the events.

THE SOCIAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT OF TRAGEDY

It is difficult to coin one definition of "tragedy" that adequately covers such diverse plays as the *Persae*, in which a historical figure is destroyed, presumably without too greatly taxing the sympathy of the audience, the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and the *Bacchae*, in which mythical characters (who would elicit varying degrees of sympathy from the audience) are destroyed through ignorance, and the *Iphigenia at Tauris* or *Helen*, in which noble mythical characters are rescued, presumably to the audience's delight; indeed, the quest for a single definition of tragedy has been described as "vain."[1] This is, however, too hasty an admission of helplessness. At the very least, we can conclude that the Athenians accepted all non-satyr and non-comedic plays performed at the City Dionysia as tragedy. That is, tragedy is, in the first instance, defined by its performance venue.

It is, however, possible to go beyond the definition of tragedy as those non-satyr and non-comedic plays performed at the City Dionysia and to come up with a descriptive, if not prescriptive, definition of tragedy. Tragedy had recognizable and accepted conventions: actors and a chorus adopted the characters of others and interacted with one another to tell a story; the story was adapted from either the mythic or the recent past; musical accompaniment and performance within the public sphere; and a general avoidance of the obscene. In addition, tragedy can be defined in part by its approach to its topic: tragedy preserves a distance between the author and the audience, unlike comedy where there is no gap between the author and the audience (compare the frequent addresses of the characters to the audience and, in particular, the *parabasis*). As well, tragedy contains a distance between the author and the subject matter, where the tragedian will not offer first-person commentary on his chosen topic. As Glenn W. Most demonstrates, the tragedians experimented with the form and content of tragedy, adapting them to their immediate purposes and artistic vision; the poet's artistry lay in his ability to manipulate and adapt the formal guidelines.[2]

---

[1] J.D. Denniston and D.L. Page, eds., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957).

The vast majority of extant tragedies have a mythic content and the number of historical tragedies was comparatively small. I suggest there were two interrelated reasons for the limited number of historical tragedies: the flexibility of myth appealed more to the poets because it provided greater room for creative expression than did history; and there was a lack of historical events suitable for Athenian tragedy during the Peloponnesian war and following Athens' defeat by the Spartans. We will now examine these factors.

The flexibility of myth is illustrated by the various conflicting versions of myth, such as the difference in the story of Oedipus among Homer (*Od.* 11.271-81), Stesichorus (*PMG* 222b), and Sophocles (*OT*, *OC*, and *Antigone*), or the conflicting nature of Heracles as both great hero (e.g., *Trachiniae*) and comic glutton (e.g., *Alcestis*). It was possible for poets to modify a myth, and even to go so far as to change the outcome from play to play (as Euripides did in his two *Hippolytus* plays).[3] This variation was not possible for accounts of events from contemporary history: a poet would not be able to change the outcome of, e.g., the battle of Marathon, or even the general circumstances of it, before an audience of *Marathonomachoi*. The events of Marathon, as well as the events of the other battles of the Persian Wars, were too well known and too great a source of pride to the Athenians to permit significant change.

---

[2] Most's article is a very insightful and informative, if a bit jargon-heavy, discussion of genre theory, especially as it relates to tragedy (2000, 15-35).

[3] Phaedra turns from a shameless seductress who is killed only when her treachery is exposed to a virtuous tool of divine anger who kills herself to protect her honour. See W.S. Barrett. ed., *Euripides, Hippolytus* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1964], 11-12; 15-45.

The second factor in the failure of historical tragedies to flourish was the lack of appropriate subject matter following the Persian Wars. The events of the Peloponnesian war (431-404), culminating in the defeat of Athens by Sparta, would afford little acceptable subject matter for the Athenian tragic stage. It would be one thing to enjoy a tragedy in which your side is the victor, but quite another to watch a tragedy in which your side suffers. The Athenian reception of Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus* illustrates this: following the production of the play, which took as its topic the destruction of the Athenian colony of Miletus, the Athenians fined the poet one thousand drachmas and forbade the play's re-performance.[4] It is unlikely that any tragedian could have managed to turn a defeat into a victory, since a lengthy dramatization of an Athenian defeat, even one caused by Athens' own generosity, would still be unwelcome to an Athenian audience; it was, however, unnecessary to present a defeat since the tragic poets could choose events which they wanted to depict and ignore those they did not.

THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE

Phrynichus is the first tragedian known to have written on a topic of contemporary history. Unfortunately, as is so often the case, his plays are lost. We do, however, have a few short fragments from his *Phoenissae* (475) and tantalizing references to his *Sack of Miletus* (ca. 493) and the *Dikaioi* (*Just Ones*) or *Persae* or

---

[4] "The Athenian people make it known that they will not bear to see anything on stage that affects them too painfully; the tragedians learn the lesson and know how to avoid too current events, unless those events are a source of mourning for others, a mourning timelessly transformed in a hymn to Athens' glory, as in the *Persians*," (Nicole Loraux, *Mothers in Mourning with the Essay 'Of Amnesty and its Opposite,'* trans. Corinne Pache [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998], 86). This idea is shared by Gregory Nagy who, in his forward to Loraux, notes "tragedy must represent the grief of the Other, not of the Self. The Other must be distanced from the Self, whether in time (hence the appropriateness of myth in general) or in space (hence the appropriateness of Persia in Aeschylus' *Persians*)," (xi). For discussion of the *Sack of Miletus*, see my pages 105-112.

Synthokoi (*Men Sitting Together*).[5] Although we lack sufficient textual evidence to analyze the structure and content of his plays, and hence his contribution to the theme of the Persian Wars, we do have the hypothesis for Aeschylus' *Persae*, which alludes to strong similarities between the *Persae* and the *Phoenissae*. As well, the circumstances surrounding the first performance of the *Sack of Miletus*, with the subsequent banning of all future productions of the play and the fining of the playwright, is indicative of the play's content and what the audience was willing to allow on the tragic stage.

We are better served when it comes to the plays of Aeschylus. In addition to the complete text of his *Persae* (472), we have fragments of and references to his *Oreithyia* (*TrGF* F 281; produced ca. 475) and *Aetnaeae* (*TrGF* F 6-11; produced ca. 475).[6] An analysis of Aeschylus and, in particular, his *Persae*, will, therefore, constitute the bulk of this chapter.

There are also fragments of and allusions to tragedies on historical topics by several authors from the late Classical to the Hellenistic period. There is visual evidence for a lost tragedy on the battle of Marathon. A fourth-century vase painting shows a King, wearing a crown and wielding a sceptre, sitting on a throne. A caption identifies him as Darius. He is being addressed by a messenger and is surrounded by alarmed advisors. Above him, Apate ("Deceit") is attempting to entice Asia from her seat, while Athena is leading Hellas to Zeus. The combination of Darius, the personifications of Asia and Hellas, and the messenger and alarmed advisors suggests that the subject of the painting was Darius and the battle of Marathon. The level of detail, especially in the costumes of the figures has suggested that the vase was inspired by a tragedy.[7] It is unclear whether the scene shows the preliminaries to the invasion or its outcome. The presence of the messenger suggests the latter, while Apate and Asia suggest the former. Alternatively, the scene may encapsulate the entire play, indicating both the preliminaries to the invasion (the role of Apate) and its disastrous results (the presence of the alarmed messenger). In addition to the visual evidence, there may be textual evidence for the Darius play. An extant fragment (*TrGF* adesp. F 685 [=*POxy*. 3161 frr. 1 and 3]) contains the traces of "Lydians" (fr. 1) and the lament of a Persian King (fr. 3). It is, unfortunately, impossible to determine if the King is Darius, and hence the fragment represents the Darius play, or if he is Xerxes, and hence a fragment of either Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* or some other, unknown, play.[8]

---

[5] The date of the *Sack of Miletus* is debated, as is the identity of the play with its triple title. These issues are examined below (the date: pages 105-112; the title of the play: n.46).

[6] For discussion of the *Aetnaeae*, see Appendix A.

Marie-Christine Villanueva-Puig, however, has argued that the vase does not represent a particular tragedy, but rather was influenced by the campaigns of Alexander against Darius III (334-330). She argues that in the mid-fourth century, the campaigns against Darius III were more significant to the Greek world than were the earlier campaigns against Darius I, and so were more likely to be the subject of vase paintings; the vase is part of a series by the Darius painter depicting battles between the Macedonians and the Persians; and the scene of tribute on the lower register is more readily understandable in the context of Darius III than Darius I.[9] Nevertheless, as the

---

[7] A.D. Trendall and T.B.L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London, 1971), no.III.5.6. For more detailed discussion of the dependence of vase painting on tragedy, see Oliver Taplin, "The Pictorial Record," in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P.E. Easterling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 69-90, esp. pages 80-7.

[8] For discussion of the attribution of the play to Phrynichus, see C. Anti, "Il vaso di Dario e I Persiani di Frinico," *AC* 4 (1952): 23-45.

[9] Marie-Christine Villanueva-Puig, "Le vase des Perses: Naples 3253 (inv. 81947)," *REA* 91 (1989): 277-98.

Athenian oratorical tradition suggests, the Greek victory in the earlier campaigns against the Persian Empire remained politically and culturally significant to Athens, in particular as a means to recall earlier glory, thus making plays on that subject possible. Furthermore, vase paintings of early tragedy were particularly popular in the fourth century, so that the vase could fit in with the general tendencies of fourth-century vase painters.[10] Wealth is a defining characteristic of the Persians and so the scenes of tribute on the lower register are at home in any depiction of the Persian court. Finally, new plays on topics from the time of the Persian Wars were produced in the Hellenistic period, such as the *Marathonomachoi* of Lycophron.[11] We can, therefore, assign the vase with some degree of confidence to the context of Darius and Marathon rather than that of Darius III. The topic would seem to suggest an Athenian audience.

We also have a substantial fragment of a play on Gyges, which further indicates the interest of the Greeks in Eastern matters, or perhaps Eastern matters as conveyed by Herodotus. A fragment of a play, identifiable as such by its metre, the suggestion of dialogue, and the presence of at least two characters, was found at Oxyrhynchus (*POxy.* 2382 [=*TrGF* F 664]). It consists of sixteen mostly complete lines that preserve the names of Gyges and Candaules and the speech of a Queen, outraged at having been seen nude. The subject, familiar from Herodotus (1.8-12), is readily identifiable: the usurpation of the Lydian throne by Gyges.[12] The sixteen lines of the Gyges tragedy contain the Queen's monologue in which she describes her emotions as she realized what had been done to her, her sleepless night, and her plan to confront Gyges and take revenge. The Gyges tragedy would likely have dealt with the crime that preceded the Queen's distress and its aftermath in similar detail. The subject was taken not from Greek mythology nor from contemporary events, but rather from "the ancient history of an Eastern race."[13]

---

[10] N.G.L. Hammond and Warren G. Moon examined vase paintings and concluded that vase painters ca. 520-460 often elected to paint scenes inspired by early Greek tragedy ("Illustrations of Early Tragedy at Athens," *AJA* 82 [1978]: 371-83).

[11] For Hellenistic plays on topics of the Persian Wars, see page 102.

The date of the play is debated with opinion being divided between the fifth and the third century. Lobel and Page argue for the fifth century on the grounds of metrics and "common sense,"[14] with Lobel believing that the ascription of the play to Phrynichus is "not patently absurd."[15] Hugh Lloyd-Jones suggests further that if the play can be securely dated to the fifth century, the tradition preserved in the *Suda* crediting Phrynichus with the creation of the first female character may contribute to the identification of Phrynichus as the author of this tragedy, if early, with its strong female character.[16] The evidence is, however, very tenuous, and certain considerations weaken the case: there is no evidence with which to assess the validity of the anecdote regarding Phrynichus and female characters; the presence of such a character, or even a strong one,

---

[12] Plato presents a different version of the affairs of Gyges, Candaules, and the Queen: Gyges takes a willing and active role by seducing the Queen and usurping the throne rather than being forced into action by the arrogance of Candaules and the anger of the Queen (*Rep.* 359d-360b).

[13] D.L. Page, *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1951), 4.

[14] E. Lobel, "A Greek Historical Drama," *PBA* 35 (1949): 207-16; D.L. Page 1951, 4-5. It is especially desirable to date this play to determine if the Greek interest in the East following the Persian Wars led to an interest in early Eastern history as well, or if the interest in the East lasted for centuries after the Persian Wars. It would also be interesting to know if the poet pre- or post-dated Herodotus. The similarities between the play's account and that of Herodotus suggest that one of the authors followed the other. If post-dated, then the poet took his inspiration not from myth or contemporary events, but from a prose history (J.A.S. Evans, "Herodotus and the Gyges Drama," *Athenaeum* n.s. 33 [1955]: 336).

[15] Compare Victor Martin, who states that the ascription of the play to Phrynichus "ne semble pas déraisonnable" ("Drame historique ou tragédie? Remarques sur le nouveau fragment tragique relatif à Gygès," *MH* 9 [1952]: 2).

[16] Hugh Lloyd-Jones, "Problems of Greek Tragedy: Pratinas and Phrynichus," in *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: the Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1990], 231-6.

cannot be used to mean that the author was the first to use them; and Phrynichus was not the only author to use them. We cannot, therefore, use the presence of female characters to attribute to Phrynichus all plays by unknown authors in which they appear. On the other hand, Kurt Latte also on the grounds of style and prosody assigns the play to the Hellenistic era.[17] In the absence of the discovery of further fragments, it is unlikely that this problem will be conclusively resolved. We can, however, conclude that Eastern matters other than the Persian Wars were of interest to the Greeks and a popular topic for poetry in general and tragedy in particular.

There is also evidence for a play concerning the fate of Croesus (ruled 560-546). J.D. Beazley has reconstructed fragments of a red-figure hydria depicting a scene in which an oriental King, wielding a sceptre, sits on a flaming pyre while Greek flute-players play in the foreground. Beazley dates the vase to the period ca. 480-450, with a slight preference for the date 470-460.[18] Although the fate of Croesus was narrated in Bacchylides' third ode (dated to 468), Beazley rejects the possibility that the vase depicts a scene from a lyric poem; he argues that the level of detail and action in the painting implies something more visual as the source of the scene. Since lyric odes are narrative and have no visual element, Beazley, on analogy with other vase paintings inspired by tragedy, confidently identifies the vase as a scene from a tragedy. Nevertheless, vases inspired by epic—an equally narrative genre with no visual element—argue against Beazley. We ought not, therefore, to reject so readily the possibility that the vase is inspired by a lyric poet such as Bacchylides rather than by a tragedy.

---

[17] Kurt Latte ("Ein antikes Gygesdrama," *Eranos* 48 [1950]: 136-41); see also J.C. Kamerbeek, "De novo fragmento tragico in quo de Gyge et Candaule agitur," *Mnem.* 5 (1952): 108-15.

[18] J.D. Beazley, "Hydria Fragments in Corinth," *Hesperia* 24 (1955): 309 and see n.10.

Beazley is somewhat reticent about identifying the subject, preferring simply to call it "a lost tragedy, surely, with an Oriental, probably a Persian, subject."[19] Nevertheless, as Croesus' appearance in both the *Histories* of Herodotus and an ode of Bacchylides attests, Croesus was a well-known figure, associated with an equally well-known and unique episode, namely, Cyrus' abortive attempts to burn him alive.[20] It is, therefore, very likely that the scene depicted in the vase painting is about him. The story of Croesus would be appropriate for a tragedy: an exalted man is brought low by the gods; that Croesus suffers not so much for his own deeds as to expiate the crimes of an ancestor increases the audience's sympathy for him and hence the pathos of the potential tragedy.[21]

There was a revival during the Hellenistic period where, again, tragedies on historical events from both the recent and distant past were performed. The Athenian poet Moschion (died ca. 300) wrote a *Men of Pherae*, thought to be about the assassination of Alexander, tyrant of Pherae (369-358), at the hands of his wife.[22] Moschion is also credited with a *Themistocles (TrGF* F1). That title, because it refers to a known individual, is stronger evidence for the content of the play than are titles deriving from groups. The title, together with a fragment of the play containing a description of a naval battle, strongly suggests that the play deals with events from the life of the Athenian statesman Themistocles including, but not necessarily limited to, the naval battles of the Persian Wars.[23] There is also a *Themistocles* by the poet Philicus; unfortunately, we have only the title. The subject may be the Persian Wars or some other noteworthy event from the life of Themistocles (e.g., his ostracism or the death sentence leveled against him [*in absentia*] by the Athenians). The *Suda* attributes a *Marathonomachoi* to the Hellenistic poet, Lycophron. Finally, there is the *Mausolus* by the fourth-century Athenian Theodectas (*TrGF* 72 F3b). This play presumably focuses on some event from the life of Mausolus, the ruler of Caria (377-353).

---

[19] Beazley 1955, 319.

[20] Bacchylides 3 and Herodotus 1.86-87.9 recount the attempted immolation of Croesus; they do, however, disagree on the particulars of his fate. Bacchylides records that Croesus is transported to the land of the Hyperboreans, Herodotus that he becomes an advisor to his captor, Cyrus. Both authors do agree that Croesus faced his (potential) death bravely. It would be very interesting to know the approach the unknown poet took to Croesus' fate. If the poet narrated Croesus' escape, it might be possible to date it to the late fifth century where it would fit with Euripides' escape plays, (e.g., *Helen*, *Orestes*, and *Iphigenia at Tauris*).

[21] B. Snell, "Gyges und Kroisos als Tragödien-Figuren," *ZPE* 12 (1973): 197-205; Hdt. 1.1-13.

[22] =*TrGF* 3. Snell notes that the plot of the play involved the assassination of the tyrant at the hands of his wife and brothers-in-law, citing O. Ribbeck, *RhM* 30 (1875): 155ff. Xenophon's *Hellenica* (6.4.35-7) provides a colourful and dramatic account of the assassination and may have been the inspiration for the tragedy.

It is tempting to conclude that the popularity of the Persian Wars and the Greek/Athenian victory in them led to the production of historical plays for the comic stage as well. Edith Hall cites as evidence for comedies on the Persian Wars the mention of a *Persians* by the Sicilian poet Epicharmus (fl. ca. 485-467; *PCG* v.1 frr. 110-111), a *Persians* or *Assyrians* by the Athenian poet Chionides (fl. ca. 486; *PCG* v. 4 Test. 1), and a *Lydians* by the Athenian Magnes (fl. ca. 486; *PCG* v.6 Frr. 3-4).[24] Unfortunately, little remains of these plays except their titles and, in the absence of any textual or anecdotal evidence, titles that denote groups are insufficient evidence for the content of the plays. Group titles often derive from the chorus and are therefore rarely indicative of the play's content. We can compare, for example, the usefulness of the titles of Aristophanes' *Acharnians* or *Frogs* in determining the plot of the respective plays; similarly, there was a *Phoenissae* by both Phrynichus and Euripides but with completely different topics.[25] The titles of the comedies by Epicharmus, Chionides, and Magnes do suggest the presence of Persians and the approximate dates of the poets are appropriate for plays on Persian topics. Nevertheless, the evidence of the titles alone is too weak to conclude that the plays are narratives of the Persian Wars. The reference in Epicharmus to gold is interesting, and may point to one of the standard characteristics of the Persians, but is uninformative on the whole.

---

[23] Hall 1996, 8. We can compare Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, in which the plot revolves around only one event from the general's life: the consequences of his return from Troy following the sacrifice of his daughter, Iphigenia.

[24] Hall 1996, 8.

Pickard-Cambridge sees further evidence for the historical content of these plays in a comment of a scholiast on Pindar *Pythian* 1.98.[26] This evidence, like that of the group titles, is weak. The scholiast notes that the *Islands*, a comedy by Epicharmus, a poet active in the courts of both Gelon (487-478) and Hieron (478-467), made reference to Hieron's role in Locri's victory over Anaxilas of Rhegium (477/6). The *Islands* was produced before the death of Hieron in 467 and consequently near to the events in question. Pickard-Cambridge concludes from the scholiast's comment that "political subjects were not altogether barred to Sicilian comedy."[27] There are, on the other hand, references to contemporary events found throughout Aristophanic comedy (e.g., *Acharnians* or *Frogs*) without the play being devoted to re-enacting contemporary history. Likewise, Epicharmus' *Persians* may have made only passing reference to the

---

[25] The Phoenician women of Phrynichus' play are women at the court of Xerxes awaiting news of the defeat at Salamis; those of Euripides' play are war-captives at Thebes during the battle for the Theban throne (i.e., one play is historical; the other mythical).

[26] Pindar's first Pythian commemorates Hieron's chariot victory of 470: he was announced as Hieron of Aetna, in recognition of his founding Aetna in 476/5 (see also Diod. 11.49). For the scholia, see A.B. Drachmann, ed., *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-17; reprint Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1966-9).

[27] Arthur Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* 2nd ed. rev. T.B.L. Webster (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 271.

Persian Wars. Furthermore, Sicily was not Athens, and what was appropriate for the Sicilian stage was not necessarily appropriate for the Athenian stage.[28]

The number of historical tragedies is dwarfed by the number of tragedies on mythological topics.[29] Nevertheless, we can conclude that certain historical topics were deemed acceptable for the tragic stage. In particular, topics on Eastern matters seem to have been popular. Historical tragedies did not end with Aeschylus, but continued into the Hellenistic Age, and here too the emphasis seems to have been on matters connected with the Persian Wars. As community-oriented poetry, the tragedies on the Persian Wars would have helped to shape and spread Athenian understanding of the Wars.

THE PLAYS OF PHRYNICHUS

I: *SACK OF MILETUS*

We will now turn to look at the earliest historical tragedy, Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus*.[30] The play took as its topic the destruction of Miletus in 493. During the Ionian

---

[28] The evidence for a satyr play on the Persian Wars is equally unsound. An inscription from the second century attributes a satyr play, entitled *Persai*, to an Anaxion (*TrGF* 1.202). As with comedies, group titles alone are insufficient evidence for the content of plays.

[29] The Hellenistic poet Ezekiel wrote a tragedy, the *Exagoge*, which took as its subject the exodus of Jews from Egypt. H. Jacobson's edition of the *Exagoge* collects the evidence for the influence of Aeschylus' *Persae* on the *Exagoge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983: 23-8; 185 n.7). In both plays, a people (Greeks/Jews), seemingly helpless in the face of a numerically superior enemy (Persians/Egyptians), receive divine aid and so triumph over their enemy. Aeschylus' influence on Ezekiel points to the enduring popularity of the *Persae*.

[30] Phrynichus was born ca. 530. His age and nationality make it probable that he was a veteran of the Persian Wars, despite the absence of any explicit evidence. The *Suda* gives 511 as the date of Phrynichus' first victory, but see M.L. West, "The Early Chronology of Attic Tragedy," *CQ* 39 (1989): 251-4, for reasons for distrusting the *Suda*'s entry. West argues that the author(s) of the *Suda* relied on an epitome that assigned a regular three Olympiad interval between Thespis, Choerilus, and Phrynichus, the three known predecessors of Aeschylus, the regularity of the intervals suggesting that the dates are fabricated. The date of 476 for his victory with *Phoenissae* has been accepted since R. Bentley first argued the case in 1699 (*The Works*, ed. A. Dyce, New York, 1966 [1836], 306). The evidence may derive from Plutarch, who

Revolt (499-494),[31] the Athenians and Milesians attacked and burned the Persian city of Sardis. In retaliation the Persians immediately sacked the city of Miletus, vowing future vengeance on the Athenians. In the process of their attack on Miletus, the Persians killed most of the men and enslaved the women, children, and the few surviving men. The Athenian tragedian Phrynichus (fl. ca. 511-476) wrote a play about the disaster, not one word of which has survived.

The *Sack of Miletus* is high on the list of works whose loss we can lament. It was the first known historical tragedy and is unique in Greek poetry in that it is a lengthy narrative of a Greek disaster.[32] Despite the loss of the text, Herodotus' account of its first (and only) performance allows us to be reasonably certain about the date of the play's performance, its content, and Phrynichus' presentation of the events. The context of the anecdote as well as its phrasing provides the date of ca. 493 for the production of the *Sack of Miletus* and suggests an emotional depiction of the destruction of the city and the fate of its citizens. The title of the play clearly indicates the topic, while the reaction of the audience to the play suggests a presentation of unmitigated suffering.

In his narrative of the destruction of Miletus, Herodotus discusses how Athens and Sybaris, two cities singled out for their close ties to Miletus, reacted to the news of the disaster. Despite the Milesians' earlier gesture of sympathy for the Sybarites on the

---

notes that, during the archonship of Adeimantus (477-6). Themistocles set up a plaque commemorating his role as *choregos* for a successful play by Phrynichus (*Vit. Them.* 5.5).

[31] Herodotus saw Athenian participation in the Ionian Revolt as the catalyst for the Persian Wars (5.97.3).

[32] The Greeks tended to avoid poetic record of defeats. Epitaphs for the fallen are an exception since they do not commemorate the defeat but rather the valour and contribution of the fallen. Epinicia also avoid mention of defeats; Pindar mentions how hateful the defeated are, even to their mothers (*Ol.* 8.69, *Pyth.* 8.85-7). For an analysis of Bacchylides' extensive description of a prior defeat, see my "Bacchylides *Absolvens*: the Defeat of Alexidamus in Bacchylides 11," in *Celebratio: Thirtieth Anniversary Essays at Trent University*, eds. J.P. Bews, I.C. Storey, and M.R. Boyne (Peterborough: Trent University Press, 1998), 42-50.

occasion of the sacking of their city (Hdt. 6.21.2), the Sybarites did not reciprocate when a similar misfortune befell the Milesians (6.21.1). Instead they allowed the disaster to pass unremarked. Herodotus then notes the contrasting behaviour of the Athenians who demonstrated their sympathy for the fate of the Milesians in various ways (ἄλλῃ πολλαχῇ). He singles out their treatment of Phrynichus following the production of the *Sack of Miletus*: ἐς δάκρυά τε ἔπεσε τὸ θέητρον καὶ ἐζημίωσάν μιν ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκήια κακὰ χιλίῃσι δραχμῇσι, καὶ ἐπέταξαν μηκέτι μηδένα χρᾶσθαι τούτῳ τῷ δράματι, "the theatre burst into tears and fined him 1000 drachma for reminding them of their kins' misfortune and outlawed further performance of the play" (6.21.2).[33] Just as the Milesians properly mourned the loss of Sybaris, the Athenians properly mourned that of Miletus; the behaviour of both Miletus and Athens to their friends' misfortunes stands in conspicuous contrast to the Sybarites' inappropriate behaviour.

Herodotus clearly locates the first performance of the *Sack of Miletus* in the time when gestures of sympathy are expected, that is, soon after the events that elicit sympathy, namely the destruction of Miletus. Herodotus notes that the Athenians mourned in various ways, including their public display of grief in the theatre and their subsequent punishment of Phrynichus. Although "various ways" could suggest acts of mourning occurring over many years, the phrase καὶ δὴ καὶ ("and in particular") picks up from the adverbial ἄλλῃ πολλαχῇ, "in various ways," and singles out the most noteworthy element of their mourning: their treatment of Phrynichus.[34] Since Herodotus wants to contrast appropriate reactions to the disaster with inappropriate ones and so singles out the Athenians' censure of the playwright, we can date this action to the time when such a gesture would be most welcome and appropriate as a sign of mourning, that is shortly after the fall of Miletus. The date of the *Sack of Miletus* is then probably ca. 493.

---

[33] The banning of future performances and the Athenians' obvious distaste for the *Sack of Miletus* certainly contributed to the loss of the play. These factors may also be to blame for the loss of the other plays in the trilogy. Since no mention is made of their reception, it is tempting to assume that the other two plays were unrelated in subject matter, and so occasioned no sentiment worthy of notice. Alternatively, the *Sack of Miletus* may have been the first play performed, with continued performance of the trilogy vetoed by the audience.

The traditional date for the performance of the *Sack of Miletus* has been challenged. Ernst Badian first, briefly, questioned the date, arguing that "you can only remind people of what they may be presumed to have forgotten and it would take longer than a few months to forget the destruction of one of the greatest cities in the Greek world if one felt ties of kinship with it."[35] Later, in separate articles Badian and Joseph Roisman offered detailed reasons for rejecting the traditional date; their argument has had some success in casting doubt on the date.[36] I will therefore examine the issue of the date here and offer evidence to support the traditional date of ca. 493.

Part of Roisman's argument against the traditional date hangs on its reliance on Themistocles' archonship in 493/2: Themistocles, as archon, selected a play that would make the Athenians aware of the Persian threat and force them to take preventative steps; the censure of Phrynichus reflected Athenian dislike of his sponsor, Themistocles. As Roisman correctly notes, we do not know enough about the play's content to assume a political agenda; therefore, we cannot use the archonship of Themistocles, his alleged political motives for selecting the play, or his fall from favour as evidence for the date and reception of the play. By rejecting the involvement of Themistocles, we lose one pin on which the traditional date hangs. As we shall see, this loss is not fatal to the traditional date.

---

[34] J.D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959), 225-6.

[35] E. Badian, "Archons and *Stragegoi*," *Antichthon* 5 (1971): 15 n.44. Joseph Roisman, "On Phrynichos' *Sack of Miletos* and *Phoenissai*," *Eranos* 86 (1988): 15-23. Badian returned to this issue many years later in "Phrynichus and Athens' οἰκήια κακά," *SCI* 15 (1990): 55-60.

[36] E.g., Edith Hall accepts Roisman's arguments and consequently distrusts the date (1996, 7 n.37).

Roisman argues for a much later date, ca. 479, on the strength of the charge against Phrynichus as recorded by Herodotus: ὢς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκήια κακὰ, which Roisman translates as "for reminding them of their own misfortunes."[37] Roisman pins his argument for the later date on his reading of the phrase οἰκήια κακά. He (and later, Badian) argues that the phrase οἰκήια κακά could refer only to "their [i.e. the Athenians'] own misfortunes." Roisman and Badian locate the Athenians' misfortunes in the sack of their city by the Persians in 479. *Oikeia*, however, refers to anything that is one's own and this includes one's kin.[38] Athens was the colonizer of Miletus and so shared in the Milesians' misfortunes.[39] Furthermore, Roisman's analysis is counter to Herodotus' anecdote. The contrast between inappropriate and appropriate reactions to the misfortunes of one's friends would not exist if the only way Athens had demonstrated its sympathy for the Milesians was to weep twenty years later for Athens' own, lesser, misfortunes.[40]

---

[37] Roisman rejects Badian's assertion concerning memory and forgetfulness (Badian 1971, 15 n.44); he correctly comments that Badian's interpretation of ἀναμιμνῄσκω, "to remember" is too restrictive, arguing that "given the nature of the human memory and the possibility that the Athenian public mind was occupied with other things besides the fall of Miletus, the use of the verb 'to recall' or 'to remind to' by Herodotus could still be interpreted as referring to a time contemporary or near-contemporary to the Ionian catastrophe" (Roisman 1988, 17). Furthermore, one can remind someone not only of what they have forgotten, but also of something they would prefer to forget (A.J. Podlecki, *Life of Themistocles: A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence* [Montreal: McGill-Queens, 1975], 7 n.9).

[38] D. Rosenbloom, "Shouting 'Fire' in a Crowded Theater: Phrynichos' *Capture of Miletos* and the Politics of Fear in Early Attic Tragedy," *Philologus* 137 (1993): 164.

[39] Herodotus recognizes the kinship ties between Athens and Miletus (1.141.1; 5.97.2).

[40] Compare Rosenbloom 1993, 170-1, where a similar misreading mars the assessment of the anecdote.

Badian's remaining evidence for the late date of the *Sack of Miletus* is his preference for Ammianus Marcellinus' account of the play's reception (28.1.3) over that of Herodotus.[41] To justify accepting the fourth-century AD historian's account over that of the near-contemporary Herodotus, Badian posits a source contemporary with Phrynichus and used by Ammianus Marcellinus but unknown to Herodotus. The unlikelihood of the existence of a source, contemporary with Herodotus but ignored by the historian who often cites conflicting sources, and a source which left no trace in other authors but is found in Ammianus Marcellinus almost eight hundred years later, calls into question the evidence of Ammianus Marcellinus.

There is, therefore, no reason to change the conventional date of Phrynichus' first (and only) performance of the *Sack of Miletus*. Herodotus clearly indicates that the play was performed shortly after the events it described, that is ca. 493. The *Sack of Miletus* is thus our earliest known tragedy on a topic from contemporary history and it (or at least its reception) did have an influence on later historical tragedy. Although Phrynichus' play was not strictly speaking about the Persian Wars, the sack of Miletus was an important prelude to the Persian invasion of mainland Greece.

Our title for Phrynichus' play derives from the Herodotean anecdote and, even in the absence of fragments of the play, is firm evidence for the subject of the play. That Herodotus can refer to it as the *Sack of Miletus* (Φρυνύχῳ δρᾶμα Μιλήτου Ἅλωσιν)

Rosenbloom accepts the traditional date, but also sees the Athenians as weeping for their own problems rather than those of the Milesians. He too rejects Badian's assertion about the significance of ἀναμιμνήσκω, noting "the verb presupposes no more than the stimulation of a mental image of something other than the thing that stimulated the image, but related to it by similarity or difference. This is how Plato defines the noun *anamnesis* (Plato, *Phd.* 74d 9-d2)." Rosenbloom then sees the Athenians, who had been reminded of what they could expect at the hands of the Persians, as weeping for their own potential misfortunes rather than the Milesians' actual ones.

[41] Badian 1996, 53.

with the expectation of being understood by his audience, suggests that this title must reflect the content of the play.[42] We can accept the title as genuine, in accordance with the practice of early titles and Herodotus' easy usage. The greatest value of this title is that it is clearly indicative of the content of the play. The ease with which Herodotus can refer to it as the *Sack of Miletus* in his *Histories* indicates that the play dramatized the actual destruction of the city and the fate of the citizens.

The noun ἡ ἅλωσις, "sacking," suggests the complete destruction of a city and the enslavement of its people.[43] Such a depiction would help to account for the grief of the Athenians who witnessed the fate of their kindred city. Further insight into the content of the play is found in the reason for the penalties assigned to Phrynichus "for reminding them of their misfortunes." The "misfortunes" the play depicted must have been severe to account for the audience's grief and to warrant such punitive action.[44] This might suggest either the implicit blaming of Athens for its failure to help its kindred city avoid such a fate, or else simply the vivid re-enactment of the evils suffered by the Milesians.

---

[42] A. Nauck, *TrGF* 1889 721 has questioned the play's title as given by Herodotus on the grounds that it does not refer to the chorus or to the main character. Rosenbloom, while remaining cautious about the validity of Herodotus' title, lists many examples of a play's title deriving from something other than the chorus or lead character. He notes that most of these titles derive from episodes in the Homeric or Cyclic epics (e.g. Aeschylus' *Ransom of Hector*, or Sophocles' *Marriage of Helen*); he suggests that with the title *Sack of Miletus* (if genuine) Phrynichus may be harkening back to Homeric poetry, perhaps to validate his tragedy (1996, 160 n.3). To Rosenbloom's catalogue, we can add Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* (produced 467). The eponymous Seven do not form the chorus of the play, which instead consists of a group of young Cadmean women. Nor do the Seven physically appear in the play as characters; instead they are described only in a series of messenger speeches (375-652) delivered to the main character, Eteocles. Nevertheless, their implied presence informs the play's plot and action. Aristophanes' *Frogs* (produced 405) confirms the validity of *Seven against Thebes* as a title. In response for a request for the title of his play infused with Ares, the character of Aeschylus responds τοὺς ἕπτ' ἐπὶ Θήβας, "the *Seven Against Thebes*" (1021). Aristophanes and his audience must have recognized the play in question from its descriptive title in order for the line to signify. The same title appears, along with the other titles of the trilogy, in *POxy*. 2256 fr.2.

[43] Both Herodotus and Aeschylus use the term to refer to the fate of Troy (Hdt. 1.5; Aesch. *Ag*. 589). Herodotus also uses it in reference to the fate of Babylon, which sees its defences and city-gate destroyed and 3000 of its citizens slaughtered; the survivors are, however, permitted to remain in their city (3.156-9). Euripides' *Trojan Women* vividly dramatizes the horrors of the sacking of one's city and the consequences for the citizens.

[44] As Lloyd-Jones notes, the fine itself was not all that severe (1990, 233). Nevertheless, the actual forbidding of future performances would carry a great deal of weight in conveying the audience's displeasure to the poet.

One other possible factor contributing to Athens' negative reaction to the play may have been their dislike of the portrayal of Miletus. The discussion of the *Sack of Miletus* is embedded in Herodotus' account of the fate of Miletus (6.18-22). Herodotus opens his account of the fate of Miletus with a brief summary of events: following the Persians' victory over the Ionians, the Persians attacked Miletus by land and sea and overwhelmed it. He ends his summary with the statement that such a fate had been predicted by an oracle (6.18), provides the text of that oracle, which had characterized the Milesians as the "doers of wicked deeds" (6.19.2), and confirms that the prediction was fulfilled and that Miletus is empty of Milesians (6.19.3). Then follows the discussion of Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus*. Herodotus concludes this section by reiterating that now Miletus has no Milesians (6.22). Herodotus picks up with his account of the play from his quotation of the oracle with the comment that these things did come to pass. In the course of his narrative, Herodotus confirms the truth of the oracle's prediction and does not contradict its description of Miletus as the "doer of wicked deeds." This suggests that Herodotus accepted the oracle's assessment of Miletus. In addition to the destruction of Miletus, the *Sack of Miletus* may also have included reference to the oracle and evil deeds allegedly committed by Miletus. This need not imply explicit condemnation. Instead, there may have been some suggestion that the Milesians' destruction was fated to expiate prior bad deeds.[45] This is, however, highly speculative.

---

[45] We can compare the fate of Croesus, also the subject of a tragedy (see pages 101-102) who suffered not

One lesson that is perhaps to be learned from the reaction of the Athenians to the *Sack of Miletus* is that dramatizations of Athenian catastrophes, including those that touch upon their kin, were not to be shown on the tragic stage. Although the traditional date seems to indicate that play was produced at a time when expressions of lamentation would be accepted, it would appear that such expressions are not appropriate for the tragic stage.

II: *PHOENISSAE* (*PERSAE*?)[46]

Phrynichus' second play on a topic of contemporary history, the *Phoenissae* (*TrGF* 8-12), was far more successful and we are better informed about it. It was produced in 476 with Themistocles as *choregos*, and took first prize. Like Aeschylus' *Persae*, its plot was driven by the reaction of the Persian court to news of the defeat at Salamis. Although there are few fragments of the *Phoenissae* extant which would point to its content, the hypothesis to the *Persae* compares the two plays and suggests that there were strong similarities: Γλαῦκος ἐν τοῖς περὶ Αἰσχύλου μύθων ἐκ τῶν Φοινισσῶν Φρυνίχου φησὶ τοὺς Πέρσας παραπεποιῆσθαι, "in his work on

---

for his own misdeeds but to expiate the crimes of his ancestor, Gyges (Hdt. 1.1-13).

[46] The play is identified as the *Phoenissae* in the hypothesis to the *Persae*. There is, however, "growing and justifiable suspicion" that Phrynichus' play is not the *Phoenissae* (Taplin 1977, 63 n.2). The title *Phoenissae* is not found in the *Suda*'s entry, although there is the triplet *Just Ones* or *Persians* or *Men Sitting Together* (s.v. Phrynichus). It is possible that *Phoenissae* is an alternate title for the same play, although four alternate titles for one play seems excessive. Phrynichus is known to have written connected trilogies and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the ancient sources confused the titles: *Phoenissae* appeared in the same trilogy as the *Just Ones* or *Persians* or *Men Sitting Together*, and the sources substituted the title *Phoenissae* for that of *Just Ones* (Lloyd-Jones 1990, 234). Roisman summarizes the controversy (1986, 21-2). As the evidence now stands, this question seems irresolvable; I will therefore retain the title *Phoenissae* for the title of the play with its marked similarities with the *Persae* of Aeschylus.

Aeschylus' plots, Glaucus says that the *Persae* was modeled on Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*."[47]

The base meaning of παραποιέω has the connotation of borrowing something with changes; it is not necessarily pejorative. Although Thucydides could use it of a false seal (1.132) that does have negative connotations, it can also have the neutral meaning "to alter slightly." Pausanias uses the verb to account for the name of the Altis, the sacred precinct of Zeus at Olympia, by deriving it from τὸ ἄλσος or 'grove' (5.10). A more telling usage is in Athenaeus: πολλὰ δὲ τῶν Ξάνθου παραπεποίηκεν ὁ Στησίχορος, ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν Ὀρέστειαν καλουμένην, "Stesichorus borrowed many things from Xanthus, such as the *Oresteia*" (1.513a). The younger poet Stesichorus is seen as having adapted in his *Oresteia* the work of the older Xanthus but is still considered the author of the poem. There seems to be no suggestion or accusation of plagiarism, but simply of inspiration or indebtedness. Stesichorus built upon the earlier work of Xanthus but made sufficient changes in order to be identified as the author of a new work. The hypothesis to the *Persae* suggests that there are pronounced similarities between the *Phoenissae* and the *Persae* of Aeschylus without suggesting that the two plays were identical in plot or character. We will examine Aeschylus' *Persae* below. For now, we will concentrate on Phrynichus' approach on the Persian Wars.

The title *Phoenissae* derives from the play's chorus of Phoenician women. Although it is possible that the women are slaves, given the importance of the

---

[47] The hypothesis to the *Persae* places its performance during the archonship of Menon (473/2). It would then have been performed in the spring of 472, eight years after the events it describes, before an audience reasonably familiar with the events it depicted and who had seen the *Phoenissae* only four years earlier. Glaucus is commonly identified as the fifth-century scholar, Glaucus of Rhegium, who wrote a treatise *On the Ancient Poets and Musicians* within decades of Phrynichus and Aeschylus. If Glaucus did write the hypothesis, then his dates suggest a reasonable familiarity with both poets and so a reasonable assurance

Phoenicians in Xerxes' navy (Hdt. 7.89; 8.85), it is also possible that they are the wives and, ultimately, widows of the Phoenician sailors. At some point prior to the start of the play, the Chorus had left their homeland and arrived at the Persian court (*TrGF* F 9-10). According to the hypothesis to the *Persae*, the *Phoenissae* opens at the court and the Phoenician women, if free, may have been guests of the court since the start of the war and the departure of their husbands, or may have arrived specifically to learn the outcome of the war and the fate of their husbands. Both possibilities suggest a large role for the Chorus in the *Phoenissae*, perhaps comparable to that of the Chorus of trusted but elderly advisors in the *Persae*. Their status as the free wives of sailors would give the play an added dramatic impact as they reacted to the news which would have had a greater impact on them than had they been slaves. For these reasons, I think they were the wives of combatants rather than slaves.[48]

One significant difference between the *Phoenissae* and Aeschylus' *Persae* is that the former opened with the news of Xerxes' defeat while in the latter the disaster is first foreshadowed and then announced. Phrynichus has been criticized for opening with the news of the disaster by those who think that informing the audience of the outcome at the start of the play results in a play that is "markedly less dramatic" than the *Persae*.[49] Despite the audience's foreknowledge, there is still plenty of scope for dramatic tension.

---

that his evidence is reliable (Hall 1996, 105).

[48] Of course, Euripides in his *Trojan Women* dramatizes the plight of the newly enslaved. These women, however, were the previously free royal and aristocratic women now turned into slaves: they are the mighty, brought low and as such, their fates, and their reaction to their fates, would be of interest to the Athenian audience. An Athenian audience would be perhaps less likely to be interested in the plight of regular slaves.

[49] Lloyd-Jones 1990, 234. See also Albin Lesky, *Greek Tragic Poetry*, trans. Matthew Dillon (New Haven: Yale University Press 1972), 33 and Sylwester Dworacki, "Some Remarks on the Greek Historical Tragedies," in *Scaenica Saravi-Varsoviensia: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und zu seinem Nachleben*, eds., Jerzy Axer and Woldeman Gürler (Warsaw, 1997), 20-1.

We can compare Euripides' *Trojan Women* which opens with news of the fall of Troy; the drama then unfolds through a number of increasingly tense and horrific scenes as the previously free women wait, helplessly, to learn their fate which has resulted from the fall of their city and the deaths of their husbands.[50] While Persia itself does not fall and the Phoenician women need not worry about their own enslavement, a defeat in war is always a disaster and the consequences, especially for the women, are in themselves capable of creating dramatic tension.

The chorus of Phoenician women may place the tragedy within the domestic sphere.[51] According to the hypothesis to the *Persae*, the *Phoenissae* opens with a eunuch preparing seats for the magistrates. This may suggest that the play included the official reaction to the defeat and that of the Phoenician women as they received official news concerning the fate of their husbands and the outcome of the war. It is tempting to refer to Herodotus' *Histories* to flesh out the action of the *Phoenissae*. According to Herodotus, Xerxes executed a number of his Phoenician sailors for having lost their ships at Salamis and attempting to blame the Ionians; the play may include the reaction of the wives to the execution of their husbands in addition to their fears for the fate of the husbands as a result of the defeat (8.90.1-3). This is, of course, highly speculative and we cannot import the knowledge of Herodotus into the mind of the playwright.

The loss of Phrynichus' plays is lamentable. He was the first known playwright to address contemporary events in tragedy and so would be valuable evidence for the nature and history of historical tragedies. Furthermore, he would provide a useful *comparandum* for Aeschylus' version of events in his *Persae* as well as for his approach to the task of narrating recent history in tragedy. From the anecdotal tradition and what survives of his plays, we can conclude that the narration of recent events on the tragic stage was acceptable, provided that they did not touch too deeply on the city's recent, personal wounds. Since the setting of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* was the Persian court, with its suggestion of luxury (the strewing of the pillows) and decadence (in the character of the eunuch), we could perhaps see in him the origins of the Barbarian as Other. If the play narrated the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis, as suggested by the hypothesis, we have still more evidence that Athens did not ignore the battle of Salamis.

---

[50] The *Trojan Women* opens with Hecuba lying in the dust. She learns that her daughter Cassandra is to become a slave, that her daughter, Polyxena, was slaughtered on Achilles' tomb, and sees her daughter-in-law, Andromache, sent into slavery while she herself is left to tend to the funeral rites for her murdered grandson, Astyanax. The play ends with the destruction of the city as Hecuba herself is led off into slavery.

THE PLAYS OF AESCHYLUS

I: *PERSAE*

We are better informed about Aeschylus as a playwright and about his *Persae*. Judging from the comment of the scholiast on the *Persae*, Aeschylus modeled his play on Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*. There is a similar awareness of Aeschylus' debt to Phrynichus in Aristophanes. In the *Frogs*, the character of Aeschylus remarks, somewhat defensively,

> ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν ἐς τὸ καλὸν ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ
> ἤνεγκον αὔθ', ἵνα μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν Φρυνίχῳ
> λειμῶνα Μουσῶν ἱερὸν ὀφθείην δρέπων
> Yes, but I brought them [my songs] from a fair source for a fair purpose, lest I appear to be culling the same holy meadow of the Muses as Phrynichus (1298-300).[52]

---

[51] Hall 1996, 105.

[52] Jean Taillardat collects examples of the metaphor of the garden of the Muse in *Les images d' Aristophane*^{2} (Paris, 1965), 436 and nn.4-7. Choerilus makes a similar use of the image of the Muses' meadow as the source of inspiration, combining it with a desire to write something new (*SH* 317); see page 208. Of Aeschylus' claim, Taillardat notes that Aeschylus is lying since the first line of the *Persae* (τάδε μὲν Περσῶν τῶν οἰχομένων, "we [are called 'the Faithful'] of the Persians who have gone") is very close to that of the *Phoenissae* (τάδ' ἐστὶ Περσῶν τῶν πάλαι βεβηκότων, "these belong to the

This is of course not the historical Aeschylus, but the fictional one of Aristophanes; nonetheless Aristophanes' creation of Aeschylus must reflect Aristophanes' perception of the real Aeschylus as being indebted to Phrynichus, and possibly defensive about it; the Athenian audience could perhaps see some justification in it.

Two plays on the same topic are unlikely to account for the defensiveness of Aristophanes' Aeschylus in a culture that accepted and enjoyed varying treatments of the same topic by several poets. Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides all wrote tragedies on the murder of Clytemnestra without incurring criticism, even oblique, for it. That both Phrynichus and Aeschylus were writing when the genre was just beginning to take shape may help to account for the possible defensiveness of Aeschylus. There may have been a general rivalry, or simply a perceived one on the part of Athens, between the two poets who were thought to have been the most influential on the genre of tragedy.

Aeschylus is an author well equipped to narrate the story of the Persian Wars. Tradition records that he was a participant in the battle of Marathon and may also have fought at Salamis.[53] As well, he had lived through the "fear years" which followed the Athenians' disastrous attack on Sardis and culminated in the Persian invasion at Marathon.[54] Athens' fear of the Persian Empire was exacerbated by the fate of Miletus and made even more real by the production of the *Sack of Miletus* and the knowledge that

---

Persians who departed long ago" (436 n.8). Regarding "Aeschylus'" claim, Kenneth Dover notes that ἀλλ’ οὖν indicates "dismissal rather than denial" of the charge (ed., *Aristophanes: Frogs* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1993], 349). Compare Denniston 1954, 442, who notes that the combination ἀλλ’ οὖν appears "in answers, introducing an objection, protest, or remonstrance."

[53] *Vita* 4; Heraclides Ponticus f.170; Ion *FGrH* 392f. Given Aeschylus' age and nationality, we can accept as factual the tradition that he fought at Marathon and likely fought at Salamis as well, since he is unlikely not to have fought in defense of Athens when his city-state was again faced with such a threat. We do, however need to heed Lefkowitz' warning concerning the biographical tradition (Lefkowitz 1981).

[54] Hall 1996, 4-5.

Athens was next on the list of Persian targets. Furthermore, the preparations at Athens for a second Persian invasion dampened spirits, as did the defeat at Thermopylae, the losses at Artemisium, the strategic evacuation of Athens and its subsequent destruction by the Persians. Athens' jubilation in their victory was mitigated by the casualties and by their need to rebuild their city; Aeschylus may also have had the further pain of his brother's death at Marathon (Hdt. 6.114).

Although Aeschylus was a combatant in various battles, his knowledge of the Wars was likely limited. He would have been aware only of what was happening in his own area of the battlefield and not necessarily anywhere else.[55] Furthermore, he is unlikely to have been informed of the overall strategy of the generals. He was also presenting his play to an audience comprised largely of those who, likewise, had lived through the events, either as participants in the battles or those who waited, with some trepidation, at Athens or Salamis for news of the battle's outcome. Like Aeschylus, they would not have had detailed knowledge of the big picture of the battle, but rather would know what had happened in their own limited area of the battlefield. The non-combatant citizens would have had to rely on the stories told by friends and relatives who had been involved in the fighting. This lack of detailed knowledge would have provided Aeschylus with some liberty in his presentation of events. Furthermore, by setting the play in the Persian court, Aeschylus bought a great artistic freedom in his portrayal of the Persians, their court protocol, and the reaction to the news of their defeat.

As Christopher Pelling notes, what was necessary in such a play was not complete historical accuracy in every detail, but rather verisimilitude wherein Aeschylus created

---

[55] Richmond Lattimore, "Aeschylus on the Defeat of Xerxes," in *Classical Studies in Honor of William*

Persian characters who respond to news of the actual battle in a believable manner.[56] Although Aeschylus had to present the course of the battle and its outcome in keeping with what the public knew to be the case and so expected, he had great liberty in his presentation of the reaction of the Persians. That Aeschylus was successful is suggested not only by the reception of the *Persae* but also by Timotheus' adherence to Aeschylus' presentation in the *Persians*. Essentially, dramatic license allows Aeschylus to focus on Salamis and present it as the victory that won the war while omitting any lengthy or detailed mention of the other battles. For his own dramatic purposes, it was necessary to omit specific reference to Marathon. Within the self-contained universe of the *Persae*, the battle of Marathon had little relevance and needed to be suppressed in order to magnify the defeat of Xerxes. Aeschylus will say what he, or his text, needs to say for the purposes of praising Salamis.

The only other battle to receive any mention is Plataea (816-20). Thermopylae and Artemisium are understandably omitted. Aeschylus does not, however, deprive the Spartans of credit for their victory at Plataea, referring to the Doric spear (817) and the heavy Persian casualties that resulted from the battle (818-20).[57] He does, however, play down the significance of that battle and the Spartans' contribution to the Persian Wars. The opening report of the Persian messenger highlights the finality of the Persian defeat at Salamis: at one single blow, Persia's prosperity and the entire Persian army were destroyed (249-55). Since the bulk of the messenger's speech then describes the battle of

---

Abbott Oldfather (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943), 82.

[56] Christopher Pelling, "Aeschylus' *Persae* and History," in *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed., Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 1. On Aeschylus' role in the creation of the Persians as the Barbarian "Other," see page 31.

[57] In this context, "Doric" is "quite specifically Spartan" (Hall 1996, 164).

Salamis, we can assume that this is the one blow that has destroyed the Persians. Plataea is presented as a relatively inconsequential engagement since Xerxes has already been defeated and the war essentially won.

Aeschylus puts a very human face on the Persians. He includes three separate catalogues of Persian heroes:[58] in 21-48, the Chorus sing of those high-ranking Persians who had marched out against the Greeks; at 320-8, the Messenger provides a partial list of confirmed dead; finally, in the *kommos* at 955-1001, the Chorus and Xerxes lament further casualties. The catalogue recalls those of the *Iliad* (e.g., 2.494-754, 816-77) and of Hesiodic poetry, that is, those who had earlier used poetry to commemorate and narrate the great deeds of the past. Aeschylus might thus be aligning himself with the great poets of antiquity. The epithets which describe the Persians also point to the stature of the defeated (e.g., βασιλῆς βασιλέως ὕποχοι μεγάλου, "kings subject to the Great King" [24]; ταγοὶ Περσῶν, "Commanders of the Persians" [24]; and ἔφοροι, "rulers" [25]) or to their martial prowess (e.g., φοβεροὶ μὲν ἰδεῖν, "terrible to behold," [27] δεινοὶ δὲ μάχην, "fearsome in battle," [27] or τοξοδάμας, "masters of the bow" [31]). Little glory accrues to those who defeat the weak or unskilled. By emphasizing the status and skill of the dead, Aeschylus enhances the glory of those who killed them. The human face of the Persian dead makes their loss that much more horrifying and therefore more damning for Xerxes.

---

[58] Hall notes that the names provided by Aeschylus do not match those recorded by Herodotus (1996, 109); compare Broadhead 1960, 318-21. In any case, historical authenticity would be impossible and we need not fault either author for historical inaccuracy, as does Lattimore (1943, 84-8); instead as Hall notes, the names in Aeschylus preserve the impression of barbarian speech and contribute to the dramatic atmosphere. Since the audience could not have known the names of the Persian soldiers, the foreign sounds of their names would signify as much to the audience as would an accurate roll call.

Aeschylus' catalogue of Persians who fought and died at Salamis is not balanced by one of the Athenians who helped to win the victory. This absence is understandable from both a literary and a cultural standpoint. Aeschylus' omission of the Greeks who died serves to keep the audience's focus on Persian losses rather than on their own; although all war entails casualties on both sides, the audience need not be reminded of their own cost during their celebration of the victory. Furthermore, although it may have been possible to name those Greeks who had performed well in battle, it would have been invidious to single out only those who had survived; this would have deprived those who had fought but did not return of the public glory awarded those who survived, and would have deprived the families of the fallen of any form of public, albeit vicarious, honour. Finally, Aeschylus' omission is understandable given the nature of Athenian tragedy. Tragedy was primarily a communal event, in which the customs, history, and glory of Athens were presented for public consumption; it seems not to have been a venue in which individuals were held up before the state. There is no mention of contemporary individuals in Athenian tragedy, although the evidence of Dio Chrysostom implies it was possible (21.11).[59] To single out living individuals on the public, tragic, stage may have been inappropriate although not outright forbidden.[60]

Aeschylus assigns to Xerxes all blame for the disaster of Salamis and hence sole responsibility for all deaths. Although the gods' role in the destruction of the Persians is noted, this does not diminish Xerxes' culpability.[61] To this end, during the course of the play he completely isolates Xerxes from all supporters and deprives him of the deference due his rank. Aeschylus accomplishes this with the skillful use of character and dialogue.

---

[59] Dio Chrysostom comments that it is shameful (αἰσχρόν) to name the living in tragedy (21.11). Dio, writing in the first century AD is, however, contrasting contemporary writers of tragedy (οἱ δὲ νῦν) who do not name the living with the ancient writers (οἱ μὲν ἔμπροσθεν) who did.

[60] This convention holds true only for the public tragic stage. Aristophanic comedy allowed, and perhaps encouraged, the presentation and discussion of individuals (e.g., Cleon) on the public, comic, stage.

The play opens with the Chorus, composed of Xerxes' trusted and handpicked advisors (τὰ πιστά) to whom, as a mark of their great standing, Xerxes had entrusted the guardianship of the empire during his absence (1-7).[62] The Chorus, although confessing to feelings of anxiety for the expedition compounded by the lack of news, is initially supportive of their King. Upon their entrance, they refer to him as "Lord Xerxes, the King, son of Darius" (5-6) and then consistently by an honorific; this respect lasts until news of the defeat reaches them. By the end of the play, they have assigned all blame for the disaster to Xerxes; as they lament the disaster and accuse him of it, they even refer to him, in his presence, by name devoid of any honorific (924). Although they open and close their speech respectfully (with "King" [919] and "King of the land" [929]) and commiserate with their king for his loss, when it comes time to assign blame for the defeat it is "Xerxes," devoid of any form of deferential address, who is solely and publicly held responsible.

In the first stasimon, as the Chorus begin to sing of their misgivings, they refer to Xerxes as θούριος ἄρχων, "aggressive King," (74). θούριος has both the positive connotation of "aggressive" and the negative one of "raving" or "mad."[63] Since the Chorus balance their use of the word with a description of Xerxes as a "son of the golden race," and "equal to the gods" (80), and with reference to his "divine flock" (75), they must mean it here in its positive sense.[64]

---

[61] "Causality on the divine level is generally paralleled by culpability on the human" (Anthony J. Podlecki, *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966; 2d London: Bristol Classical Press, 1999], 22-3.

[62] Hall notes that the Chorus, by referring to themselves in the neuter plural, opens the play on a formal and solemn note, suggesting "the self-conscious formality of the Persian court" (1996, 106).

[63] Broadhead 1960, 181; Hall 1996, 114.

There is a sharp juxtaposition in the presentation of the characters of Darius and Xerxes. As the Chorus lament news of the disaster at Salamis, they sing that it was Xerxes alone who led the men away and destroyed them (550-4). The repetition of the name of Xerxes, in the emphatic first position in each of the three lines, leaves no doubt as to whom the Chorus blame or to the lack of respect they now have for their King.[65] The Chorus then switch to the subject of Darius, noting that the "lord of the bow" and the beloved leader of Susa was always benign to his people (555-7). The contrast between the bare reference to Xerxes and the respectful and loving reference to Darius is sharp, as is the contrast between their effects on their country and subjects.

The positive portrayal of Darius and the emphasis on Salamis does not come at the expense of Athens' other great victory, Marathon. There is an oblique reference to Marathon, one perhaps instantly familiar to the audience: in speaking of the Greek army, the Chorus remarks that the Athenian army is "large enough, having caused the Medes great harm" (236). Several factors indicate that this is a reference to Marathon: the news of the defeat at Salamis has not yet reached the Persian court; Thermopylae was a significant Persian victory, despite its heavy casualties; and Artemisium was essentially a stalemate. There is a more pointed reference at line 244 where the Chorus answer the

---

[64] Hall notes that ἰσόθεος, "equal to the gods" is an "innocent enough word in epic, but with measures of excessive self-aggrandisement in tragedy" (1996, 114). See also D. Conacher, "Aeschylus' Persae: A literary commentary," in *Serta Turyniana*, eds. John L. Heller and J.K. Newman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974), 151.

[65] This is not to suggest that Athens does not receive glory for its role in the victory. Following the blaming of Xerxes, the Chorus blame the Persian ships, in which the forces departed, and the Ionian ships, which destroyed them at Salamis (562-3). As in the preceding condemnation of Xerxes, "ships" is found in the emphatic first position in three consecutive lines.

Queen's question concerning the ability of the Greek army to withstand invaders. They state that the Athenians were sufficiently strong to have destroyed Darius' "large and excellent" army.[66] Finally, there is an explicit reference to Marathon, and to the Persians who died there, at 475. It is significant that unlike Xerxes who is blamed for the deaths at Salamis, it is Marathon itself that is blamed for the deaths there. Furthermore, these deaths are used not against Darius, during whose rule they occurred, but against Xerxes who failed to learn from the lesson taught by Marathon (476-7).

In contrast to Xerxes and his responsibility for the defeat at Salamis, Darius is virtually blameless for his own role in invading the Greek world and the massive loss of life at Marathon. The only time that Darius may have been blamed is in a corrupt sentence during the Necromancy. The Chorus, addressing Darius, sing τί τάδε δυνάτα, δυνάτα, / †περὶ τᾷ σᾷ δίδυμα διὰ † γόενδ' ἁμαρτία, "Master, Master, what is the reason for this double error?" (675-6).[67] The "double error" may mean Xerxes' repetition of Darius' mistake in invading the Greek world.[68] Because of the metrical corruption, the lines are impossible to restore and so the question cannot be readily resolved.

---

[66] Although the Queen is not named in the text, the name "Atossa" does appear in the list of characters in the play. It is possible that she was originally unnamed and that the specific name was added to the list of characters by a scholiast who was familiar with Herodotus. Some have argued that she is not named or addressed by name in the play to reflect Athenian customs concerning the public naming of women (most recently Maria Brosius, *Women in Ancient Persia: 559-331 BC* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 16-17; Brosius also examines the evidence for the historical Atossa and her official role as wife, mother, and dowager queen in the Persian court.). This is not, however, the case in tragedy where mythical women are named quite freely, (e.g., in a similar situation in the *Agamemnon*, the Chorus of aging councilors, in the absence of their King, address their Queen by name: ἥκω σεβίζων σὸν Κλυταιμήστρα κράτος, "I have come, Clytemnestra, respecting your power" [258]). The avoidance of the name of the Queen may reflect Greek perception of Persian royal protocol, rather than Greek custom. Non-Greek practices are further illustrated by the Chorus' prostration before the Queen (152) and their characterization of her as the wife and mother of a god (157). These characteristics demonstrate the hierarchical nature of the Persians and their arrogance at equating their King with divinity, which was at odds with the Athenians' democratic and freedom-loving nature.

[67] Hall's rendition (1996).

[68] This interpretation was first suggested by a scholiast, and adopted by F.A. Paley, ed., *The Tragedies of Aeschylus* (London, 1874) [cited by Broadhead 1960, 172]. Broadhead, however, calls this interpretation

Nevertheless, it might be possible to suggest a reading of these lines. The "double error" might be that of Xerxes, who seems to be blamed for repeating Darius' mistake in invading the Greek world. This is suggested by the reference in the preceding lines to the "ships that are no longer ships" (τρίσκαλμοι / νᾶες ἄναες 679-80). The Chorus does not mention the loss of the land army, either under Darius or under Xerxes; instead, they locate the disaster on the seas—the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis. It is also worth noting that Darius is essentially absolved of any previous comparable mistake. In speaking to Darius, the chorus can refer to his ἁμαρτία, which conveys overtones of "missing the mark" rather than of culpable error. The mitigating of Darius' mistake is enhanced by the context. The Chorus call upon Darius for help in dealing with the current disaster, thus implicitly absolving him of blame for the earlier disastrous invasion under his rule. Dramatic license notwithstanding, Aeschylus cannot pretend that nothing bad occurred under Darius; he can, however, gloss over Darius' mistake while heaping abuse on the head of Xerxes in order to play up the victory at Salamis and enhance the glory of those who helped to achieve it.

The contrast between Xerxes and Darius is enhanced by the contrast in the speech of the two Kings and by the build-up to their appearance. Xerxes arrives on-stage sharp on the heels of the Chorus' condemnation for his failures at Salamis; his first words are ἰώ· / δύστηνος ἐγώ, "Oh! I am wretched!" (908-9) and, just as were Xerxes' actions upon seeing the outcome at Salamis (465-70), his words are those of a defeated man. The messenger tells how Xerxes wailed aloud (ἀνῴμωξεν [465]) and screamed shrilly

---

"hardly likely" (1960, 172). Hall is less dismissive (1996, 156). For a metrical analysis of the problems in the epode, see Broadhead 1960, 291-2.

(κἀνακωκύσας λιγύ [468]) as he witnessed the destruction of his fleet.[69] This stands in stark contrast to the picture of Darius, especially since Xerxes' actions are juxtaposed with the Chorus' *encomium* of their former King (852-902). The Chorus begin with a statement that life under "all-ruling, unharming, unconquered, godlike" Darius was excellent (852-3); they then provide a catalogue of military triumphs, from which the men always returned safe and unharmed, and a list of territories subject to the Persian King. The *encomium* ends with a pointed reference to the difference between the golden age under Darius and life under Xerxes, which is a reversal of the fortunes enjoyed under Darius (904-5). The respect the Chorus accord Darius and the Queen (before whom they had earlier prostrated themselves [151]) further contrasts with the lack of respect they now have for Xerxes. When their King arrives, the Chorus address him openly, question, and chastise him; they do not prostrate themselves. Furthermore, the return of Darius occasioned a respectful quiet, that of Xerxes an ill-omened and mournful cry (935-40).

The differing physical appearance of the two Kings is also significant. Unlike Xerxes who appears on-stage in rags and can only lament, Darius appears in full regal splendor and is able to offer welcome advice on how the Persians can extract themselves from the disaster caused by Xerxes. During the invocation, the Chorus beg Darius to appear with yellow slippers and a kingly crown (660-1). The detailed description of his dress must indicate Darius' stage-costume since otherwise the description would be superfluous and the audience disappointed. His appearance is greeted by fear on the part of the Chorus who find themselves unable either to look upon him (694-6) or to speak to him (700-2).[70] Upon his arrival, Darius speaks calmly and competently, allays the Queen's fears concerning Xerxes' safety, and speaks knowledgeably, if not comfortingly, about the future. He also resumes command and forbids any further invasions of the Greek world and so is able to prevent any further disasters. He manifests all the physical and personal qualities that Xerxes conspicuously lacks. Darius does so as a quintessential Barbarian. There is emphasis on his appearance and his status as both King and divine. The Chorus prostrate themselves to him, and emphasize the great respect they have for him. In contrast, Xerxes appears in rags, receives no prostration and no respect. This serves to highlight the inadequacies of Xerxes.

---

[69] Hall notes that the verbs used to describe Xerxes' cries belong "to the semantic register normally reserved for women" (1996, 143). The rending of clothes that accompanied his cries is equally womanish behaviour. Xerxes' watching the destruction of his forces is a common topos found in authors on the Persian Wars (for Choerilus see pages 175-179; for Timotheus, see page 249). On the funereal aspect of Xerxes' reaction, see

Xerxes' mother is the only person who has any sympathy for him, and the only one on whose support he might count; Aeschylus ensures that the two never meet. Throughout the play, the Queen is not blind to his faults or to his role in the destruction of the Persian forces and refers to him consistently as θούριος Ξέρξης, "raging Xerxes"; her use of the term, following on news of the disaster and unbalanced by any positive reference, suggests it is meant in its negative sense of "raging." Nevertheless, she attempts to lessen his culpability, attributing his decision to invade the Greek world to the counsels of wicked men on whom he relied rather than to his own ineptitude (753-4).[71] She remains adamant that her son is not accountable to the people and that, so long as he lives, his continued rule of the Empire is not to be questioned (211-4). Her two exits from the stage are marked by expressions of compassion and support for Xerxes. At 529-31,

---

page 132.

[70] The Chorus indicate that it is their respect for their former King and not their fear of him as a ghost which prevents them from speaking: σέθεν ἀρχαίῳ περὶ τάρβει, "because of my ancient fear of you," (696); this is picked up by Darius who excuses the Chorus' silence with reference to their δέος παλαιὸν, "ancient fear" (703).

[71] For discussion of the significance of Xerxes' evil advisors, see page 130.

she orders the Chorus to console him and not to add to his woes should he arrive in her absence; at 845-51, her concern lest her son appear publicly in rags prompts her to make her final exit on the pretext of meeting him and garbing him in clothes appropriate to his station.

The Queen's disappearance at 845-51 has met with some sharp criticism by those who dismiss the exit as dramatically weak and the pretext as irrelevant.[72] It is, however, a dramatically relevant and powerful scene precisely because the two principal characters do not meet.[73] The Queen's failure to reappear deprives Xerxes of his only supporter, forcing him to report the news of his defeat to a hostile audience unrelieved by any expressions of sympathy or support.[74] He is forced to endure the shame of defeat and its attendant guilt and responsibility all alone; as well he bears the overt blame for the defeat and loss of so many Persians. Furthermore Xerxes, dressed in rags throughout his time on stage, is visually humiliated.[75] Darius' appearance in kingly splendor, the Queen's concern with Xerxes' clothing, and the Athenian obsession with Persian opulence and splendor allow us to infer that the Persian advisors before whom Xerxes stands are splendidly dressed. The contrast between the disgraced king and his inferiors would be immediately apparent.

---

[72] Broadhead summarizes the issue and concludes that "[t]here is justice in the criticism [of the weak device to get rid of the Queen]," (1960, xxxix and n.1). *Contra* Wilamowitz who notes "Die Königin mußte entfernt werden, da der Dichter sie in dem ganz lyrischen letzten Akte nicht brauchen konnte, vornehmlich weil ihr Trost dem ganzen Tone des Schlusses, völliger verzweiflung, entgegengewirkt haben würde" (U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aischylos: Interpretationem* [Berlin, 1914], 46). Taplin proposes to move lines 529-31 to follow line 851; his suggestion is not adopted by West in his text.

[73] We can compare Sophocles' *Trachiniae* in which the two principal characters, Deianira and Heracles, never meet. P.E. Easterling discusses the dramatic tension resulting from the two principal characters not meeting on-stage (ed., *Sophocles, Trachiniae* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982], 2).

[74] The only other character with sympathy for Xerxes is Darius who orders his wife to take the clothing and kind words to Xerxes (832-9). His sympathy for his son does not extend to his absolving Xerxes of responsibility for the disaster, although he does mitigate his blame by stressing Xerxes' foolishness. Darius, however, must return to the Underworld before the arrival of his son. Despite Darius' claims of his influence and authority in the Underworld, he remarks that he must hurry back in order to spare himself reproach (689-92).

[75] That the Queen does not meet Xerxes and garb him in suitable attire prior to his entrance is indicated by his reference to the tattered remains of his clothing at line 1030.

The Queen's disappearance not only deprives Xerxes of his only supporter but also vividly illustrates the Athenian stereotype of the Persian obsessed with opulence and hierarchy. As Hall notes, "nothing more powerfully conveys the audience's view of the obsessiveness of Persian sartorial display" as the Queen's callous concern for her son's attire over the news of the imminent slaughter of the remaining Persian army.[76] This is even more pronounced because in contrast to the Chorus who lament the fortunes of all the Persians (843-4]), the Queen is concerned only for her son's appearance, utterly dismissing the loss of the Persian forces.[77] The appearance of Xerxes in rags takes on an added significance in his response to the questions from the Chorus. When they ask him what is left of the invasion force, he directs their attention to his lack of escort, the loss of his weapons (1020-2) and his torn clothes (1030). Aeschylus visually equates the Persian Empire with Xerxes; Xerxes with a gesture to his tattered clothes, which he had himself destroyed, signifies the destruction of the Persian Empire and his own culpability.

The Queen's mention of the evil advisors and their culpability in the destruction of the Persian forces has been read as being particularly relevant to the Athenian audience. Although the Queen, and ultimately Aeschylus, did not identify the advisors by name, modern editors have identified them as Mardonius and the Pisistratids, people whose actions had particular resonance for Athens.[78] Mardonius, Xerxes' cousin, was left in command of the Persian forces following the retreat of Xerxes and burned Athens as he himself withdrew from Attica prior to the battle of Plataea. The Pisistratids were former tyrants who ruled Athens with varying degrees of benevolence.[79] With the assistance of the Spartans, Hippias was ousted, took shelter at the Persian court, and fought against the Athenians at the battle of Marathon. The Queen, however, does not name the advisors of Xerxes and, despite the fact that Herodotus may have derived his own information from Athenian sources, we cannot import the knowledge of Herodotus into the minds of the Athenian audience. While the audience would have been aware of the deeds of Mardonius and the Pisistratids, we cannot assume that they knew of their role in Xerxes' decision to invade the Greek world.

---

[76] Hall 1996, 165.

[77] As Hall notes, "Aeschylus' decision not to include the Queen in the closing scene ensures that the focus is on Xerxes' failure as a civic and military leader, rather than her beloved son; it also means that sung dirges are only delivered in this play by males, which contributes to the overall effeminisation of Persia" (1996, 166).

[78] E.g., Broadhead (1960, 189) and Hall (1996, 161).

Xerxes' appearance in rags and the reaction of the Persian advisors to their King vividly demonstrated the significance of the victory at Salamis: the Athenian navy had not only destroyed the Persian invasion force but also the entire Persian Empire. The Chorus had foreshadowed this as they lamented the disaster at Salamis. The Persian defeat will result in the loss of Asian territories which, freed from Persian rule, will no longer pay tribute to Persia, obey the rule of the king, or prostrate themselves in their presence; furthermore, their newfound freedom will lead to freedom of speech (584-96). With the destruction of the army at Salamis came the destruction of Xerxes' power, the Persian Empire and, ultimately, Persian identity. This is summed up in the final two lines of the ode, where the Chorus state that Salamis (referred to periphrastically as "Ajax's island") holds all that remains of Persia (τὰ Περσᾶν).[80] Aeschylus expands victory of the Athenian navy into a victory of Athenian democratic lifestyle: no longer will the Persian Empire be able to command slavish obedience in word and deed from its subjects. Instead, the Athenian ideal of *isagoria*, the freedom to speak and express opinions even if contrary to the opinions of those holding power, will triumph.[81]

---

[79] The reign of Pisistratus (546-527) is often viewed as a "golden age" (e.g., Thuc. 6.54.2; *Ath. Pol.* 16.7); while initially benevolent, the reign of Hippias, Pisistratus' son and successor, became unbearable following the assassination of his brother, Hipparchus .

The Chorus confirm the truth of their prophecy when, upon the arrival of Xerxes, they fail to prostrate themselves before their King. The only thing brought to its knees is Asia itself, and not in deference but in defeat (929-30). In refusing, or perhaps simply forgetting, to perform their customary obeisance, the Chorus also implicitly reject the Queen's assertion that so long as Xerxes is alive, he is the King (213-14). They deny Xerxes the deference due his rank and subject him to close scrutiny regarding the disaster; this they do in defiance of their queen's explicit command that Xerxes, should he arrive in her absence, is not to be subjected to questions upon his return (530-1). The Chorus, comprising Xerxes' most trusted advisors (τὰ πιστὰ), no longer respect their King, the Queen's commands, or Persian protocol. In their disrespect are the seeds of the destruction of the Persian Empire.

The death of the Persian Empire is further indicated by the final scene that is laden with funereal imagery (909-1078). The arrival of Xerxes and his interaction with the Chorus takes the form of a lament for the many excellent men killed at Salamis and, ultimately, a lament for the Persian Empire as well. One significant departure from Greek funeral conventions is that the funeral is conducted entirely by men who take on the roles of the female mourners.[82] The names of the dead are sung aloud, Xerxes and the Chorus tear their hair (1056-7; 1062) and clothes (1060), beat their breasts (1054), and continually cry aloud (*passim*). Setting the play in the vicinity of Darius' tomb enhances the funereal atmosphere.[83] All that the funeral lacks is the corpse. The bodies of the dead, having been abandoned at Salamis (and later, at Plataea), are present in name alone. Aeschylus deprives them of the state funeral the Greek dead could expect. Instead, what will be buried is the Persian Empire, destroyed by the Athenians at Salamis.

---

[80] Broadhead 1960, 156; Hall 1996, 150. Ajax was a local hero of Salamis; Herodotus records prayers to Ajax prior to the battle (8.6.4).

[81] Hall 1996, 149.

Aeschylus, in addition to enhancing the Athenians' destruction of the Persians, downplays the Persians' destruction of Athens. The Queen asks, "so Athens is still not sacked (ἀπόρθητος)?" (348), to which the Messenger responds that, so long as men remain in a city, the city is secure (ἀσφαλές) (349). In this brief exchange, Aeschylus rewrites history and begins the practice of denying the effectiveness of the Persians' sacking of Athens. So long as Athenian men remain, no amount of damage done to the walls and temples and buildings of Athens can matter to the existence or status of Athens. In Aeschylus' lines, we see the use of tragedy, a very public genre, to create and codify public perception and memory.

These lines (348-9) resonate on several levels. On one level, they indicate the contrast between the Persians, characterized throughout the play as effeminate, and their opposite, the Athenians. Unlike Athens, which still has its men although not its buildings, Persia, whose structures are still standing, is devoid of men.[84] On another level, it denies the sacking of Athens by redefining what makes a city: a city is not its physical reality but instead its citizens; it cannot be destroyed so long as its citizens, and especially its defenders, survive.[85] The lines also imply the symbolic sacking of Persia that is now bereft of men. The Persians, who destroyed the city of Athens but not its men, are themselves destroyed; the Athenians, who destroyed the men of Persia but not the city, are doubly victorious.

---

[82] Hall 1996, 169.

[83] The play's hypothesis records that the action takes place before Darius' tomb; this is confirmed by the necromancy scene (623-80) and by Darius' specific references to his tomb and funeral mound (647, 659, 684 and 686).

[84] Hall 1996, 135. The Persian gods contribute to the effeminacy of the Persians. Hall analyzes the prominence of the male Olympians at Salamis, contrasting them with the effeminate Persians and notes that

Aeschylus' denial of the effectiveness of the sacking of Athens is understandable. As the Athenians' reception of the *Sack of Miletus* demonstrates, it did not do well to dwell on one's own misfortunes. In his re-writing of history, Aeschylus is able to deprive the Persians of any victories in the Wars, but he is able to preserve the status of Athens. With the sacking of one's city came not only dishonour, but also the destruction of one's very identity. Survivors were not only physically homeless, but also at the mercy of their conquerors. The *Trojan Women* clearly indicates the trauma that comes in the aftermath of the destruction of one's city. Men are killed, women lose their freedom and their identity as wives and citizens to become mere slaves in a foreign city; the complete destruction of their home city means that there can be no redemption from slavery and no reclamation of their own identity.[86] If there is no more Athens, there can be no more

---

the almost complete absence of Athena (she is mentioned only obliquely at 347) contributes to the construction of the Greeks and their gods as manly, and the Persians as effeminate ("Asia unmanned: Images of victory in classical Athens," in *War and Society in the Greek World*, eds., John Rich and Graham Shipley [Routledge: London, 1993], 127-31).

[85] Broadhead 1960, 118; Hall 1996, 135. Compare Aelian's paraphrase of Alcaeus (=426 *PLF*): οὐ λίθοι οὐδὲ ξύλα οὐδὲ τέχνη τεκτόνων αἱ πόλεις εἶεν ἀλλ' ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ὦσιν ἄνδρες αὑτοὺς σῴζειν εἰδότες ἐνταῦθα καὶ τείχη καὶ πόλεις, "a city is not stones, or wood, or walls, but wherever there are men who know to save themselves and their children and their city" (E. Lobel and D. Page, eds., *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1955]) and ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλιος πύργος ἀρεύϊος, "men are a city's warlike defence" (Alcaeus fr. 112.10).

[86] It is tempting to see the *Sack of Miletus* as illustrating the terror of the loss of one's city but my perception is likely coloured by *Trojan Women*.

Athenians.[87] Aeschylus then is able to deny the effectiveness of the sacking of Athens: despite the destruction of the buildings of Athens, its people were hidden at Salamis, were safe and so able to retake and rebuild their city and in the process reclaim their identity and status.

From the reception of the *Persae* in contrast to that of the *Sack of Miletus*, we can perhaps see a limit to what the genre of tragedy will allow: there can be no presentation of bad, or perhaps even of dead, Athenians. The *Persae* was presented in 472, some years removed from the events it narrates; in addition, there was a spatial distance imposed by the venue that did not accept displays of mourning or lamentation. Instead, Aeschylus presented a picture of one of Athens' greatest victory over the Persians. In so doing, he continued, or perhaps created, the picture of the Persians as Barbarians.

II: *OREITHYIA*

It remains to consider another play by Aeschylus that may be related to the events of the Persian Wars: the *Oreithyia* (*TrGF* F 281). Because there is little myth associated with Oreithyia save her abduction by the wind god Boreas and the subsequent birth of her two children, the wins Zetes and Calais, we can perhaps conclude from the title that her story figured prominently in the play. That Oreithyia was claimed as an ancestor of the Athenians might serve to strengthen this possibility. The story of Oreithyia's abduction enjoyed an increased prominence following the Persian Wars, stemming from Boreas' perceived intervention on behalf of the Athenians at the battle of Artemisium (Hdt.

---

[87] We can compare Sophocles' *Philoctetes*, where the outcast Philoctetes notes that being without a *polis* is similar to being dead (1018).

7.189).[88] Ca. 478, a cult site to Boreas was founded by the river Ilissus (Hdt. 7.189.3) that may have occasioned the production of the play.[89]

The play's title suggests that Oreithyia was the focal point of the plot, which presumably means her abduction by Boreas, the only event in her life of any significance to the Athenians was included in the play. This in turn suggests that, unlike the *Persae*, with its emphasis on the Athenians' actions at Salamis, the *Oreithyia* may have had a strong mythic element. The date of the play makes it likely that Salamis was narrated, or at least mentioned obliquely, although there might have been a greater emphasis on the battle of Artemisium, where her sons and husband played a role. It is tempting to see in the play a blending of the mythic past (the abduction of Oreithyia) with contemporary events (the battle of Artemisium and the direct intervention of Boreas at the request of his kinsmen, the Athenians). Allusions to mythic events of lasting significance to Athens are certainly present in other tragedies (e.g., the founding of the Areopagus in the *Eumenides*, which is narrated against the murder trial of Orestes). What makes the *Oreithyia* interesting (and its loss lamentable) is its potential for weaving the actions of the gods together with the actions of contemporary mortals. Contemporary Athenians could not have witnessed the trial of Orestes and the role of the gods that was said to have resulted in the founding of the Areopagus; many of them did, however, witness the storm at Artemisium and the role of the gods therein. Unfortunately, in the absence of the text we cannot determine to what extent the two were narrated.

Aeschylus' *Oreithyia*, like Pindar's ode celebrating that victory, suggest that the Athenians were interested not only in their victory at Salamis, but also in their actions at

---

[88] See also Hall 1989, 64 n.30

Artemisium and the events that surrounded it. It is tempting to suggest that like Pindar, Aeschylus worked to redeem Athens for what could be considered, at best, a stalemate at Artemisium. If the play did in fact include the abduction of Oreithyia together with the battle of Artemisium, where Boreas played a role, this possibility is strengthened since the actions of the gods are rarely ineffectual. If Boreas helped the Athenians at Artemisium, and if the play included a narrative of this, then Boreas is likely to have been presented as the reason for the victory; this glory could then be shed on the Athenians as well.

CONCLUSIONS

In the aftermath of the Persian Wars, poets produced several plays for the Athenian stage, dealing with the triumph of the Athenians. The tragic stage provided an excellent platform from which to shape the public perception of the Wars. The tragic festivals were open to all citizens, allowing the poets to reach virtually all segments of society. In Aeschylus' *Persae*, we see the beginnings of the image of the Barbarian as something Other than, and diametrically opposed to, the Greeks. Unfortunately, the loss of Phrynichus' plays does not permit us to conclude that Aeschylus "invented" the barbarian; Phrynichus' plays may well have inspired Aeschylus. We can, however, see in the *Persae* the earliest extant instances of what later became the stereotypical Barbarian. His Persians are weak: the departure of the invasion force leaves the city populated only by elderly men and a Queen; the army itself is then defeated by the smaller Greek force.

---

[89] Erika Simon, "Boreas und Oreithyia auf dem silbernen Rhyton in Triest," *A&A* 13 (1967): 101-26.

His Persians are also effeminate: in Xerxes' absence, they are ruled by a Queen; when they hear the news of the disaster, they react like women, weeping, tearing their hair and cheeks, and beating their breasts. Aeschylus creates the Persians as an extremely wealthy and hierarchical race, concerned more with money and the trappings of power than with their fellow citizens. Finally, the Persians are slavish, treating their King with the deference due the gods rather than a mortal; they are the antithesis of the free Greek, obedient to the laws and customs of his country rather than to a King. In Aeschylus, we also see the beginning of the Athenian appropriation of the defeat of the Persians.

Although Plataea is mentioned, its brief appearance does not detract from the play's emphasis on Salamis; the allusions to Marathon serve to keep the Athenian role in the defeat of the Persians at the forefront. This is not to suggest that Marathon was always downplayed among the Athenians. Instead, Aeschylus must downplay Marathon within the confines of the *Persae* in order to enhance the negative portrayal of Xerxes and the positive results of Salamis. It would be a mistake to transfer Aeschylus' presentation of Marathon in a play that glorified Salamis onto other Athenian, or even Aeschylean, presentations of Marathon. That the Athenians approved of Aeschylus' invention of the Barbarian and reinvention of Athens' role in the Wars is evident in later accounts of the Wars that closely follow his presentation of the Wars and the Barbarian.[90]

Aeschylus made a strong contribution to the theme of the Persian Wars. In this, he was helped by the social position of tragedy. Tragedy was a public and communal genre and therefore accessible to many. We can see Aeschylus as a primary source, if not the origin of, the popular perception of the Persian Wars and the Barbarian. Were Phrynichus' *Sack of Miletus* and *Phoenissae*, or at least large fragments of them, extant, we could perhaps see an influence of Phrynichus on Aeschylus. We can, however, see the influence of Aeschylus on Timotheus and the orators. In this way, we can see the use of poetry in conveying important information and shaping public perceptions of significant events.

---

[90] Aeschylus' "invention" of the Barbarian had an effect not only on literary accounts (compare esp. Timotheus' *Persians* and see page 240) but also the visual arts. Compare Villanueva-Puig 1989 and Paulette Chiron-Bistagne, "A propos du 'Vase des Perses' au Musée de Naples. Une nouvelle interprétation?," in *Les Perses d'Eschyle (= Cahiers du GITA* 7), eds., Paulette Chiron-Bistagne, Alain Moreau, and Jean-Claude Turpin (1992), 145-58, who traces the physical appearance of the Persians on the Darius vase to Aeschylus' presentation of the Persians in his *Persae*.

CHAPTER 3: EPIC (CHOERILUS)

In the introduction to his *Persica* (*SH* 317), Choerilus seems to set up the sterility of contemporary poetry as a straw man against which he can demonstrate the superiority of his own poem, and in the process redeem contemporary poetry's potential. Although the *dénouement* is lost, along with the greater part of the *Persica*, the anecdotal tradition combined with the extant fragments of the poem suggest that Choerilus succeeded in knocking down this straw man with a re-designed poetic style. Adopting the form and style of epic poetry along with the persona of the epic poet, Choerilus added contemporary history to the traditional mythic content of epic. The initial fame and prestige he received for his *Persica*, as well as the echoes of and allusions to his *Persica* in the Roman epic poets, suggest that his modifications of the earlier genre and the resulting poem were successful. In this chapter I will examine the evidence for Choerilus' modification of the epic genre into a vehicle to express contemporary events; I will then consider his treatment of the Wars in his *Persica* and situate him in the literary tradition of the Persian Wars.

CHOERILUS' LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Choerilus' literary forebears would likely have included Simonides' and Pindar's elegiac and lyric accounts of the Persian Wars as well as Phrynichus' and Aeschylus' tragedies. Choerilus is likely to have been aware of historical elegies and tragedies in general; this may have contributed to his desire for a new form of poetry with which to approach the same topic.[1]

Choerilus' decision to write an epic account of the Persian Wars may have been influenced not only by the lofty status of Homer and epic but also by earlier historical epics: the eighth-century Corinthian Eumelus' *Corinthiaca*, which traces the history of the kings of Corinth from the sun-god Helios down to Glaucus, the son of Sisyphus;[2] and the sixth-century Asius of Samos' genealogical epic which treated the early history of Samos.[3] Both early epic poets used epic as a means with which to catalogue the early histories of their homes. G.L. Huxley situates their activity in the age of colonization and expansion and argues that the poets deliberately chose poetry, and in particular epic, as vehicles by which to enhance the reputation of their respective homes: Asius, wanting a mythological prehistory for Samos in keeping with that of neighbouring city-states, moved Astypalaia, the eponymous heroine of Samos, to the same generation as the eponymous Europa, established Poseidon as lover of Astypalaia and so created a worthy ancestor for Samos; similarly, Eumelus vicariously enhanced the status of the myth-deprived Corinth by appropriating for Corinth a body of myth concerning Jason and

---

[1] On Choerilus' desire for a new form of poetry, see pages 193-209.

[2] For Eumelus' *Corinthiaca*, see Davies 1988, 95-103 and Bernabé 1987, 88-91; for the dating of Eumelus, see Richard Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 231-3.

[3] For the fragments of Asius, see Davies 1988, 106-14 and Bernabé 1987,127-31; for the dating of Asius, see G.L. Huxley, who favours the sixth-century date arguing that political allusions in the surviving fragments together with the epic tags and clichés suggest that "the oral tradition is still alive" (*Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969a], 95). *Contra*, C.M. Bowra argues for a date no later than the fifth century, based on Asius' vocabulary and thematic similarities to Aristophanes ("Asius and the Old-Fashioned Samians," in *On Greek Margins* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1970], 125-33; = *Hermes* 85 [1957]: 391-401).

Medea, thus enabling Corinth to trace its foundation back to the sun-god Helios, and so giving Corinth boasting-rights similar to those enjoyed by neighbouring city-states.[4]

While neither Asius nor Eumelus wrote on topics of recent history, the supposed motive behind their writing may have influenced Choerilus in his *Persica*: like Asius and Eumelus, Choerilus chose epic to convey history. Huxley argues that Asius and Eumelus wrote to provide their hometowns with a more noteworthy history. His theories are plausible and seem to be borne out by the literary record. If correct, they point to the power of poetry to confer respectability and to epic's ability to confer glory not only on the generations of heroes but also on the inhabitants of their city-states. While Asius and Eumelus wrote of the far distant, mythic, past rather than the recent, they may have influenced Choerilus in his choice of epic to confer glory on events of the more recent past.

Turning to Choerilus, we find that although his relative chronology is secure, the questions of his *floruit* and that of the composition of the *Persica* remain problematic because of the scanty and often conflicting accounts of the events of his life. An examination of the evidence for the dates of Choerilus' life is necessary to determine whether the poet was an eyewitness to the events he recounted in his *Persica*, and the extent to which his knowledge and handling of the material depended upon earlier literary or public traditions. Furthermore, an examination of the anecdotes concerning the life of Choerilus can reveal the ancient perception of Choerilus as an author and his relationship to the poetic tradition.

---

[4] Huxley 1969a, 60-79 (Eumelus) and 89-98 (Asius).

The *Suda* provides an extensive and detailed account of the life of Choerilus, but also one that is unreliable in terms of its content.[5] It is not, however, necessary to reject this evidence in its entirety. The *Suda* is in fact a valuable source of information regarding the ancient critics' perception of Choerilus and his poem, if not of his actual biography. The ancient tradition concerning Choerilus was based on a more extensive literary corpus and a richer anecdotal tradition than is currently extant; it can therefore provide extra detail with which to enhance our understanding of the poet and his poetic aesthetic.

The entry in the *Suda* (s.v. Χοιρίλος Σάμιος) is internally inconsistent and clearly confuses events from the life of the Hellenistic epic poet Choerilus of Iasus with those of Choerilus of Samos. After the rejection of the information known to belong to the Iasian poet, the following events can be securely assigned to the *Suda*'s entry for the Samian poet (the issue of their accuracy will be considered below): Choerilus was a young man (νεανίσκος) during the Persian Wars, specifically the seventy-fifth Olympiad (480-77); was a contemporary of both Panyassis and Herodotus (having escaped from slavery Choerilus became a companion, and possibly the lover [παιδικά], of the historian with whom he shared a love of literature); wrote, among other works, a poem on the Persian Wars which received the honour of public recitation along with the verses of Homer; and died in Macedon at the court of Archelaus.[6]

---

[5] For the text of the *Suda*'s entry and reasons for rejecting certain elements of it, see Appendix B.

[6] Archelaus (ruled 413-399) was a patron of the arts, who attracted *inter alios* the poets Euripides, Agathon, and Timotheus (on Timotheus' association with Archelaus, see page 270) to his court, along with the artist Zeuxis (see page 203). Similarly, Hieron of Syracuse surrounded himself with poets, including Simonides. Both rulers continued the precedent set in the Archaic age, and foreshadowed the Ptolemaic patronage of leading poets and scholars.

Although we can be sure that this information ought to be attributed to the *Suda*'s life of Choerilus of Samos, the majority of events are nonetheless suspect, having resulted from the problem typical of ancient criticism: the critics, suffering from a *horror vacui*, mine an author's work to supply material for his biography, with the common result that the poet became what he wrote.[7] The results of this practice are especially apparent in the contemporaneous dates of the life of Choerilus and the events he described, and in the nature of his relationship with the historian who recorded the same subject with a similar thematic interest.

The dating of Choerilus' youth to the seventy-fifth Olympiad, which coincides with the invasion of Xerxes, is unlikely. For Choerilus to have been a youth (νεανίσκος) in 480-477, his birth would have had to take place approximately eighteen years earlier, ca. 498 at least.[8] This would make him implausibly old (almost one hundred years old) for his more securely attested activity in the late fifth century.[9] Rather than accept the date of the seventy-fifth Olympiad, we can account for this dating of his birth by looking at the subject of his work. Following the customary habits of ancient criticism in which the words of an author are transferred to his life, the biographers who knew that

---

[7] Lefkowitz 1981, viii-ix. Lefkowitz compares the ancient biographers to contemporary psychologists for whom "every creative act must have grounding in a particular experience."

[8] Mark Golden has demonstrated the elastic and often inconsistent nature of Greek vocabulary denoting the stages of life (*Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990], 12-22). Although the catalogue of age groups found in Aristophanes of Byzantium (frr. 37-66 Slater) roughly concurs with that of the Hippocratic author, Philo (*Opif. Mundi* 36.105), the evidence from Athenian popular culture suggests that these distinctions were somewhat more fluid in application. On analogy with Athenian custom, other cultures might be expected to be equally lax in their vocabulary for age and thus in the distinctions made between the ages. Nevertheless, the sources are in agreement that νεανίσκος refers to the transitional stage between child and adult with Philo specifying the years 21-28 and Athenian authors generally reserving the term for boys who have reached their majority (approximately eighteen years). For Choerilus, then, to have been a νεανίσκος during the Persian Wars, he must have been at least eighteen years old at the start of the Wars, and so born approximately 508.

Choerilus wrote about the Persian Wars accordingly assumed that he must have lived during these same events. The securely established date for the invasion of Xerxes would appeal to critics looking for a nail on which to hang their biographies of the poet. The combination of the unlikelihood of his being still active at the advanced age of one hundred and the more probable explanation that the anecdote results from the synchronism of his life with the topic of his work, makes rejection of his youth during the Persian Wars advisable.

Herodotus was well known in antiquity and the stories of the relationship between him and Choerilus unanimously put the poet as the junior partner. While we need not accept the anecdotes as factually true, they are evidence for the perceived difference in status between the two authors. The story that Choerilus fled from slavery to the side of Herodotus puts the historian in the dominant position, perhaps as a form of patron or protector of the fugitive poet. The freeborn Herodotus would also have had a social status superior to that of the erstwhile slave. Furthermore, the remark that Choerilus conceived a love for literature while sitting at Herodotus' side (Ἡροδότῳ τῷ ἱστορικῷ παρεδρεύσαντα λόγων ἐρασθῆναι) suggests a form of student/teacher relationship.

Furthermore, the specific description of Choerilus as the *paidika* of Herodotus sets up a hierarchical relationship between the two authors, with Choerilus again clearly indicated as the junior partner.[10] The explicit remark on the beauty of Choerilus (εὐειδῆ πάνυ τὴν ὥραν), perhaps offered in support of the putative *paidika* relationship, is

---

[9] Activity in the late fifth century is attested by the association of Choerilus with both Archelaus of Macedon (ruled 413-399) at whose court Choerilus is said to have died, and Lysander of Sparta (d. 395) who retained the poet while in Samos ca. 403. See pages 148- 151 (Archelaus) and 151- 154 (Lysander).

[10] The homosexual relationship was a hierarchical one between an older man (the *erastes*) in the active and dominant role and a young boy who had just reached puberty (the *eromenos*) in the passive and subordinate

itself indicative of the perceived youth of Choerilus relative to Herodotus.[11] The consistency with which Choerilus is made subordinate to Herodotus in age and class, in his own status as an author and that of his poem relative to the *Histories*, argues for a wider difference in their respective ages than would be possible were Choerilus a young man in 480-477. The anecdotes may reflect an intellectual relationship between the poet and the historian that was transformed by the biographical tradition into a physical relationship. This suggests that Herodotus' *Histories* was thought to predate Choerilus' *Persica*.

The association of Choerilus with the poet Panyassis is equally suspect as evidence for establishing an exact date for Choerilus but nonetheless provides valuable information for determining the ancient perception of him as author.[12] Panyassis, as the kinsman of Herodotus, may have been included by virtue of his own familial relationship with the historian who was thought to have had a significant influence on Choerilus.[13] Panyassis was however better known in antiquity for his own status as an epic poet[14] than

---

position; see K.J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989) and Golden 1990, 57-60.

[11] Male beauty is often an indication of youth, especially in pederastic relationships. For example, Ganymedes' beauty attracted the attentions of Zeus (*Il.* 20.232-5) while that of Pelops' shoulder attracted the attentions of Poseidon (Pindar, *Ol.* 1-25-7). At the other end of the age spectrum Mimnermus provides an extreme indictment of the horrors of old age, which includes the loss of physical attractiveness and sexual appeal to both boys and women (Mimnermus frr. 1-6 West *IEG*^{2}, esp. fr. 1.9, where the aged man is described as ἐχθρὸς μὲν παισ̀ιν ἀτίμαστος δὲ γυναιξίν,"hateful to boys and scorned by women").

[12] Following a detailed analysis of the anecdotal evidence for the life of Panyassis, V.J. Matthews concludes "the lifespan of Panyassis can, with some justification, be dated to the period from 505/500-455/450, with, perhaps, a slight preference for the lower set of dates" (1973, 19). Panyassis himself would then have been a witness to the Persian Wars.

[13] The common consensus was that Panyassis was the uncle of Herodotus. W. Schmid, however, has argued that Panyassis and Herodotus were cousins (*Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* I [Munich, 1929], 297). Matthews, having examined the family tree for Panyassis as provided by the *Suda* (s.v. Πανύασις), supports the contention of Schmid (Matthews 1974, 9-12). That the primary source of evidence for Panyassis' family is the *Suda* means that we cannot be completely certain.

[14] That Panyassis' fame derived primarily from his *Heracleia*, a fourteen-book epic on the labours of Heracles (frr. 1-23, 26-8 Matthews]; = frr. 1-26 Bernabé) rather than from his elegiac history of Ionia

as a relative of Herodotus and, according to one tradition, it was Panyassis who revived the dying art of epic.[15] His presence in the *Suda*'s entry for Choerilus may reflect an ancient tradition regarding the chronology of epic: epic began, and achieved its greatest height, with Homer; went through a period of decadence characterized by the Cyclic poets before being revived by Panyassis; and was then re-fashioned by Choerilus into a vehicle to express contemporary history.[16] The relationship between Panyassis and Choerilus may thus reflect the perceived chronology of the epic genre rather than the exact chronology of Choerilus.

The tradition of Choerilus' synchronicity with the invasion of Xerxes and his association with Herodotus and Panyassis can be explained with reference to the common and identifiable biographical tendencies of the ancient critics. Choerilus achieved fame because of his work on the Persian Wars, had stylistic and thematic affinities with Herodotus, and so must be closely linked to both.[17] The dates and the association are inherently implausible and are vitiated by the distorting practices of the biographical tradition, and so it is best to reject them as secure details for the life of Choerilus. It is, however, informative to see how closely and consistently the *Suda* and its sources link Choerilus with the Persian Wars. According to the anecdotal tradition, Choerilus' identity

---

(*Ionica*, frr. 24-5, 29 Matthews; Bernabé assigns frr. 25 and 29 to the *incerti* and fr. 24 to the *Heraclea*) is suggested by his inclusion in the Alexandrian epic canon (see n. 34), the numerous references to his *Heracleia* (see Testimonia and frr. 7, 9-12 Matthews), and by the greater number of surviving fragments of his epic.

[15] Matthews 1974, 31. Matthews bases his theory on a statement in the *Suda* (s.v. Πανύασις): ποιητὴς ἐπῶν· ὅς σβεσθεῖσαν τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐπανήγαγε ("the epic poet, who revived the dead [lit. "extinguished"] form").

[16] We can infer the general disapprobation of the ancients for the Cyclic poets from the comparative lack of preservation of their works, the primacy accorded Homer's poems, and the concern of the ancient critics to expunge the work of the Cyclic poets from the corpus of Homer as being unworthy of the master.

[17] On the similarities between Herodotus' *Histories* and Choerilus' *Persica*, see Albin Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, trans. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer 2d ed. (London: Methuen, 1966), 304, G.L.

was almost completely tied to the Persian Wars. This, combined with the tradition that his poem was recited publicly and the prominent allusions to his poem in the Latin *recusationes*,[18] argues for the fame of the *Persica*; in turn, this suggests that Choerilus was successful in his use of epic as a vehicle for contemporary history.

It is best to reject the majority of the *Suda*'s information regarding exact dates for the life of Choerilus. We can more readily accept that which finds corroboration elsewhere, having ascertained that the other sources are in fact trustworthy, either because of the inherent reliability of the author, the proximity of the author to the events described, or the plausibility of the anecdote.

The *Suda* places Choerilus' death at the court of Archelaus (413-399) and this association of poet and ruler is found in Athenaeus. Athenaeus preserves an anecdote that he attributes to the learned Alexandrian Istros, making Choerilus a member of the court of Archelaus from whom he received a daily stipend that he squandered on gourmet food.[19] While discussing the greedy nature and rapacious habits of gourmands, a character states that, according to Istros, Choerilus received a daily stipend from Archelaus, which he spent on food (*Deip*. 8.345d; [=*FGrH* 334 F61; *test.* 4 Bernabé]). Such a story is of course completely unverifiable but Athenaeus, although a late source, is generally considered to be a reliable source and trustworthy excerpter.[20] His personal

---

Huxley, "Choirilos of Samos," *GRBS* 10 (1969): 12. For discussion of the similarities between the two authors, see page 155.

[18] For the *recusationes*, see pages 158-159.

[19] Istros was credited with both an *Atthis* and a treatise on the lyric poets. His comment on Choerilus could have come from either work. For Ister's *Atthis*, see L. Pearson, *Local Historians of Attica* [Philadelphia: Lancaster, 1942], 136-44, esp. 136-8).

[20] P.A. Brunt, exhaustively cross-checking Athenaeus' quotations and paraphrases against their originals, observes that his quotations are "more or less verbatim," while his paraphrases are "substantially accurate." Brunt thus concludes "[w]e may . . . assume that in general Athenaeus is fairly reliable" even when paraphrasing ("On Historical Fragments and Epitomes," *CQ* 30 [1980]: 481). Brunt's conclusions are not

reliability can stand as surety for the existence of Istros' comment if not its veracity. The story could have been prompted by malice on the part of Istros who, as a follower of Callimachean poetic ideals, may have shared his disdain for epic-style poets.[21] The issue is not, however, the veracity of the gastronomic anecdote, but rather the evidence it provides for the synchronicity of Choerilus and Archelaus: for a story to arise in which it is plausible for Choerilus to be at the court of Archelaus, the two must be contemporaries. Since there is no real need to make up a story which associates these two specifically in order to describe Choerilus' appetite, the story is probably acceptable.

Support for the synchronism of Choerilus and Archelaus, and hence for a date in the late fifth century for Choerilus' poetic fame, may be found in a somewhat troublesome passage in Marcellinus' *Life of Thucydides* (28-30). Cautioning his readers that there are many men named Thucydides, Marcellinus describes four of them. He starts with his subject, the historian whom he identifies by his patronymic (οὗτός τε ὁ 'Ολόρου παῖς, "the son of Olorus"), then names two others with very brief descriptions, and ends with a fourth Thucydides, that is, Thucydides the poet.[22] He goes on to state

> συνεχρόνισε δ', ὥς φησι Πραξιφάνης ἐν τῷ περὶ ἱστορίας, Πλάτωνι τῷ κωμικῷ, 'Αγάθωνι τραγικῷ, Νικηράτῳ ἐποποιῷ καὶ Χοιρίλῳ καὶ Μελανιππίδῃ. καὶ ἐπεὶ μὲν ἔζη 'Αρχέλαος, ἄδοξος ἦν ὡς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ὡς <ὁ> αὐτὸς Πραξιφάνης δηλοῖ, ὕστερον δὲ δαιμονίως ἐθαμαύσθη

---

universally accepted. Adrian Tronson concludes (based on his own study) that Athenaeus "drastically shortened, adapted, or deliberately misquoted [his sources] in accordance with the requirements of [his] contexts" ("Satyrus the Peripatetic and the Marriages of Philip II," *JHS* 104 [1984]: 124-5 n.54). Tronson further concludes that Athenaeus does so in moral contexts, such as his desire to demonstrate the ruinous effects of Philip's marriages. Since Athenaeus could have condemned Choerilus' appetite and spendthrift ways without associating the poet with Archelaus, we can perhaps accept his evidence here.

[21] On Callimachus' disdain for epic style poets in general and Choerilus in particular, see pages 185-192.

[22] Although Thucydides the poet is known only from this citation, "he could not have been an insignificant poet. Not only did Praxiphanes mention him in some very good company, but he also went on to attest to his particular fame" (Phillip Harding, *Androtion and the "Atthis"* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 183 F57). Harding takes the text to refer to the poet. At first sight, this does seem logical. As we will see, it is more likely that this detail belongs to the historian.

> And, as Praxiphanes says in his *On History*, this Thucydides lived at the same time as Plato, the comic poet, Agathon, the tragic poet, Niceratus, the epic poet, and Choerilus and Melanippides; and when Archelaus was alive, he was unknown to many, as that same Praxiphanes makes clear, but later he was well-known (29-30).

This is a problematic passage, and one could wish that the author had taken greater care with his transitions. The initial δέ is troublesome, most naturally referring to Thucydides the poet, the last figure mentioned, and introducing a new point about the poet, following from Marcellinus' mention of the father and *deme* of the poet.[23] Its immediate context—a list of other poets—would support this assumption.

Nevertheless, δέ can mark a change in subject.[24] Although one would have preferred a more marked transition from the poet back to the historian, three considerations suggest that Marcellinus has returned to discussing the historian.[25] First, Marcellinus cites Praxiphanes' *On History*, which would most naturally be a source of information for the historian rather than the poet. Second, the passage (29-30) precedes discussion of the confusion over the death of Thucydides the historian; the discussion of the many men named Thucydides may have been offered to account for the confusion surrounding the time and place of the death of Thucydides the historian and the location of his grave, all of which are discussed in detail in the following sections of the *Life*. Finally, the sense of the passage and of the *Life* as a whole argue that Marcellinus has returned to the historian: the level of detail supplied, which is lacking in the comments about the other two men named Thucydides and which is not relevant to the topic at hand, belongs more readily with the subject of the *Life* itself. Nevertheless the passage, muddled though it may be, provides support for the association of Choerilus and Archelaus.[26]

---

[23] On δέ as a "continuative connective" see J.D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 162-5.

[24] Denniston 1954, 182-3 (δέ as a resumptive particle). Compare H.W. Smyth, "Copulative δέ is common in marking a *continuation*, especially when something subordinate is added. Thus, when a new phase of narrative is developed; where attention is called to a new point or person; when an interrupted speech or narrative is resumed" (*Greek Grammar* § 2836); see also *LSJ* s.v. δέ II.2.

Choerilus' association with the Spartan general Lysander provides further evidence for the poet's activity and fame in the late fifth century, as well as offering evidence for the encomiastic nature of epic. Plutarch, in a discussion of Lysander's prestige and self-glorification immediately following the Peloponnesian War, records that the general, while in Samos, kept Choerilus in his retinue (*Vit. Lys.* 18.7).[27] Inasmuch as the anecdote seems to have little relevance to Choerilus *per se*, concerning itself not with details of the life of Choerilus but rather with the characterization of Lysander as an individual who, fond of his own glory, surrounds himself with poets in an attempt to secure poetic immortality, the anecdote can likely be accepted at face value. For the anecdote to be credible, it needs to involve plausible poets, namely poets who were alive at the time. This does not, of course, prove that Choerilus and Lysander did consort but simply that they were, or at the very least were thought to be, contemporaries.

Plutarch is not, however, a completely reliable author. C.B.R. Pelling characterizes him as a "curiously uneven writer," noting "[s]ometimes he is impressively

---

[25] Arnaldo Momigliano reads δὲ as returning to the historian, (*The Development of Greek Biography*, 2d ed. [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993], 66-7).

[26] Huxley is mistaken when he says, "it is stated...in the *Vita Marcellina* of Thucydides (29) [*sic*] that the poet visited the court of Archelaos in Macedon" (1969b, 12-13). This is rather an inference first made by R. Hirzl who argues that the text of Praxiphanes was a dialogue, discussing history, set at the court of Archelaus ("Die Thukydideslegende," *Hermes* 13 [1878]: 46-9). If Hirzl is correct, Choerilus' presence in a dialogue on history is informative for the ancient view of his poem and for the role of poetry in historiography. It is unfortunate that we do not have Praxiphanes' text.

[27] Following his successes in the Peloponnesian War, in addition to engaging Choerilus in the hopes of receiving poetic *encomia*, Lysander erected statues of himself and his generals at Delphi and accepted the vote of the Samians to rename the Heraeia, their festival in honour of Hera, the Lysandreia, presumably now a festival in honour of Lysander. Lysander's patronage of Choerilus fits with his general self-aggrandizing tendencies and points to the role of poetry in conveying public honour.

critical of his sources, sometimes absurdly credulous. His historical judgments are sometimes sensible and sophisticated, sometimes childlike and innocent."[28] Nevertheless, since the synchronicity of Choerilus and Lysander is the *prima facie* sense of the passage, and since there is no evidence to reject it, we ought to accept it.

The tradition of an association between Lysander and Choerilus is also informative for the laudatory nature of historical epic. Lysander kept Choerilus in his retinue in the expectation of poetic immortality (ὡς κοσμήσοντα τὰς πράξεις διὰ ποιητικῆς [*Vit. Lys.* 18.7]). Lysander, seeking to ensure his own immortality, actively courted Choerilus knowing that his favour would be reciprocated by an encomiastic poem. There are no extant fragments of a poem by Choerilus in honour of Lysander, and no explicit statement in the literature that such a poem was composed. Nevertheless, logic, as well as the conventions of a *charis* relationship between poet and patron, would suggest that a poet retained in the expectations of a laudatory poem in honour of his patron would at least make the attempt to compose one. Choerilus was an epic poet and could be expected to repay his patron in his accustomed genre.[29] Although we need not accept as fact the tradition that Choerilus and Lysander were associated, the tradition of their association and Lysander's motive for that association (namely, wanting a poetic record of his great deeds) points to the existence of laudatory epic.

---

[28] C.B.R. Pelling, "Plutarch's adaptation of his source-material," *JHS* 100 (1980): 139.

[29] Huxley criticizes both Jacoby (*FGrH* part 3B, vol. 1:Text p.20) and K. Ziegler (*Das hellenistische Epos*^{2}, [Leipzig, 1966], 16 and 25) for going "beyond the evidence" to ascribe laudatory epics to Choerilus, Antimachus, and Niceratus (1969b, 13 n.2). Although no poetic texts are extant, logic suggests that Jacoby and Ziegler were correct. Antimachus' membership in the epic canon identifies him as an epic poet; that Niceratus competed against Antimachus suggests that he too is an epic poet, and likely the same Niceratus whom Marcellinus identified as such. Like the epic poet Choerilus, they could be expected to sing for their supper with a poem in their customary style.

Because Lysander is unlikely to have retained an inexperienced and unproved poet for the purpose of adorning his own deeds with song, his courting of Choerilus suggest that by 395, the date of Lysander's death, Choerilus must have already established himself as a respected poet. We can further narrow this date to the time after the Peloponnesian War (the period when Lysander began his self-aggrandizement) and assign the association of Lysander and Choerilus to the period 403-395. Since the *Persica* dominated Choerilus' personal identity, it was presumably the popularity of the *Persica* and the reputation that the poem earned for Choerilus that attracted the notice of the general.[30] Choerilus was not alone in Lysander's *coterie*; he kept company with Antimachus of Colophon, Antilochus, and Niceratus of Heracleia.[31] Choerilus was, however, the only poet expressly said to be retained by Lysander (τῶν ποιητῶν Χοιρίλον μὲν ἀεὶ περὶ αὑτὸν εἶχεν [*Vit. Lys.* 18.4]). Although the reward of a cap of silver given to Antilochus by Lysander in appreciation of a poem in the general's honour suggests a favoured status for that poet as well, this largesse appears rather as a one-time gift in appreciation of a particular laudatory poem than as a regular stipend (*Vit. Lys.* 18.4). Antimachus and Niceratus did compete with laudatory poems at the

---

[30] That sections of the *Persica* had a decidedly Athenian slant need not have deterred the Spartan general from courting Choerilus. A poet who composed a poem that earned him great fame could be expected to continue to compose worthy verses, regardless of the sponsor.

[31] Of the poets mentioned, only a few fragments of Antimachus of Colophon's poetry are extant (*IEG*^{2} 37-43; *SH* 52-79). For detailed commentary and exegesis, see Victor J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996). Antilochus is unknown except for this reference while Niceratus is likely the one mentioned by Marcellinus (see page 149). Since this Niceratus defeated Antimachus in a poetry contest, and Antilochus received a large reward for his poem honouring Lysander, it is unfortunate that their poetry has not survived. Antimachus' poem in honour of Lysander is also lost, allegedly following a fit of pique on the part of an Antimachus angry at his defeat (but compare Virgil's alleged desire to have the *Aeneid* burned upon his death which suggests that this may be a *topos*). Regardless of the reason, the loss of these samples of eulogistic epic, which would have provided useful and welcome *comparanda* for the epic of Choerilus as well as fleshed out the history of the epic genre, is regrettable.

Lysandreia, but seem not to have shared the favoured status of Choerilus or even to have received the recognition offered to Antilochus.[32]

Although the exact details of Choerilus' life cannot be accurately determined, consideration of the evidence strongly supports the theory that by the late fifth century he had established himself as a respected poet and was still active at the time of Lysander's visit to Samos (ca. 403). Since the *Persica* was responsible for Choerilus' fame, as witnessed by the anecdotal tradition, it is most likely that it was this poem that attracted the attention of Lysander. It is impossible to establish the exact date of his birth, but we can conclude that Choerilus was not born during the Persian Wars; his better-attested activity during the late fifth century and the average life span of a Greek male strongly suggest that he was also not a youth during the Wars. Thus, his knowledge of the events could not have come from first-hand experience but must have derived from other common accounts, such as conversations with eyewitnesses or from earlier literary treatments. Since he is consistently described as junior to Herodotus, it is likely that the *Histories* influenced the *Persica*, with the literary dependence between the two authors being transformed into personal dependence. The most likely date for his composition of the *Persica* is thus some time after Herodotus wrote and published the *Histories*. We can therefore conclude that Choerilus wrote the *Persica* at some point between 425—when the *Histories* was well-known in Athens—and 395, the date of Lysander's death.[33]

---

[32] For the Lysandreia, see n.27 of this chapter. The poetry contest at the festival resulted in nothing more substantial than the satisfaction of a public win, the public defeat of a rival, and the tangible reward of a victor's crown for Niceratus; Antimachus had to content himself with the kind words of a young Plato who, in the hallowed tradition of the fans of the defeated team everywhere, laid the blame squarely at the feet of the officials (*Vit. Lys.* 18.5).

[33] We can infer that the *Histories* were well-known by 425 from Aristophanes' parody of the opening of the *Histories* in his *Acharnians* 524-9 (the *Acharnians* is securely dated to 425 by the *didaskalia*). As well, the

Analysis of the evidence for the life of Choerilus suggests that he had no first-hand knowledge of the Wars. He was, rather, influenced by Herodotus' *Histories* as well as poetic accounts of the Wars. The anecdotes surrounding Choerilus as a poet suggest that he was also influenced by the poetic tradition and perceptions of his place within it. Accounts of his relationship with Archelaus and Lysander suggest that Choerilus enjoyed some prominence in his own day. He was known to the Augustan poets but ultimately he was not admitted to the Alexandrian canon of epic poets; this exclusion indicates the low worth set on his poetry by the later scholars and critics, which contributed to the fragmentary preservation of his work.[34] The anecdotes associating Choerilus with Archelaus and Lysander also indicate fame for the *Persica* in the later fifth century. This in turn speaks to the continuing significance of the Persian Wars at Athens.

HERODOTUS' *HISTORIES* AND CHOERILUS' *PERSICA*

The anecdotal tradition, with its suggestions of a personal relationship between the historian and the poet, reflects a literary dependence in which Choerilus followed Herodotus in material and, perhaps, in organization. Ethnographic detail is evident in *SH* 320, where Choerilus describes the appearance, clothing, language, and homeland of just one of the contingents in the Persian army. This fragment is likely part of a catalogue in which Choerilus sets out those forces the Greeks would have to face and it is likely that

---

Histories make reference to the end of the reign of Artaxerxes (464-424) and the Spartan invasions of 431-425.

[34] Traces of the Alexandrian epic canon (οἱ ἐγκριθέντες) appear in lists given by several late authors who preserve the same five names, albeit in varying order: Homer, Hesiod, Panyassis of Halicarnassus, Pisander of Camirus, and Antimachus of Colophon (Proclus, *Chrestomathia* 15; Tzetzes, in Hesiodi *Opera* [= *Poetae Minores Graeci* 2.13], περὶ διαφορᾶς ποιητῶν 170 [= *Anecd. Graec. Oxon.* 3.340], Schol. Lycophron [= *Lycophronis Alexandra* 2.1]; Andronicus, περὶ τάχεως ποιητῶν; Michael Italicus, *Letter*

similar detail would be found in the rest of the catalogue. Similar ethnographic detail is found in *SH* 329 (=fr. 7 Colace), where a Persian comments on the public disgrace attendant upon his drinking from a clay cup.[35] This fragment is most likely part of a scene set at the Persian court which would imply a scene of perceived Persian customs. In addition to the ethnographic detail, Choerilus makes a similar distinction between East and West (*SH* 316). It is also likely that Choerilus followed Herodotus in material as well as flavour: like Herodotus, Choerilus narrated the expedition of Darius in addition to that of Xerxes and may well have included the earlier campaigns of Cyrus as well.[36]

Less certain evidence for similarities between the two authors stems from Callimachus and the Augustan *recusationes*.[37] Both Callimachus and the Augustan poets refer to an epic on the Persian Wars; the most likely candidate is, of course, Choerilus—the only known poet to have written an epic on the Persian Wars. Callimachus and the Augustan poets ignore the strict chronology of the Persian Wars, referring to events out of historical sequence, which may reflect the order of events as they appear in Choerilus. If the order in Callimachus and the Augustans reflects that in Choerilus, then Choerilus, like Herodotus, may have included digressions and background detail, which could have resulted in a non-linear narration of the events of the Wars.

Because of the anecdotal tradition, borne out by the extant fragments, we may be justified in fleshing out our perception of the scope and content of the *Persica*. We should

---

21). That the acceptance of Antimachus over Choerilus was not immediate or without controversy is suggested by the rumours of a rivalry between the two poets and their advocates (compare *AP* 11.218).

[35] For discussion of *SH* 329, see pages 175-183.

[36] For the inclusion of Darius, see pages 162-171; for the inclusion of Cyrus, see pages 185-192.

[37] For the Augustan *recusationes*, see pages 158-159.

not, however, assume that Choerilus slavishly adhered to the order of events in the *Histories* and Herodotus' perception and interpretation of events.

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE *PERSICA*

The complete *Persica* is lost. We do, however, have seven securely identified fragments, totaling nineteen lines; in addition, four lines are tentatively assigned to the poem. Choerilus has also been claimed as author for several papyrus fragments. These fragments, combined with the testimonia and the anecdotal tradition can allow us to infer the scope and content of the lost poem.

There are several titles preserved in various authors for Choerilus' work on the Persian Wars: *Persica* (Herodian, *Π. μον. λεξ.* 113); *Perseidem* (Stobeus 3.27.1]); *Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes* (*Suda* s.v. Χοιρίλος, Σάμιος); and *Barbarica*, *Medica*, and *Persica* (*POxy.* 1399 [=*SH* 314]). Although the *Suda* does mention that Choerilus wrote some other poems (ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα), it is likely that these titles are alternates for the same work rather than titles for separate poems, each devoted to matters of Eastern history. The only evidence to suggest this latter possibility is the phrase contained in *POxy.* 1399: Χοιρίλου ποιήματα / βαρβαρικά μηδικά· περσ[ικά. At first glance, the papyrus does seem to preserve three distinct titles for poems of Choerilus: *Barbarica*, *Medica*, and *Persica*. This is, however, unlikely, since such an occurrence could be expected to leave some trace in the anecdotal tradition or in the literary evidence.[38] It has also been suggested that these are chapter headings for

---

[38] B.P Grenfell & A.S. Hunt (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 11 [1915], 245). J.U. Powell (*Collectanea Alexandrina* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1925], 250), F. Jacoby (*FGrH* 696 F 33d), W. Schmid and O. Stählin (*Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* I.ii. [Munich: Beck'sche Verlag, 1934], 543-4), and Huxley (1969b, 14-15) all

Choerilus' poem on the Persian Wars.[39] This is, however, unlikely since it is unclear what the distinction between Medes, Persians, and Barbarians, terms used interchangeably by the Greeks, would be in such a context.[40]

Further evidence for the content of the *Persica* can be inferred from allusions to it made by several Augustan poets as they catalogue those themes that they decline to treat. These include mythic and historical topics treated in epic, ranging from the Gigantomachy and the Trojan War, to the Persian Wars, to the wars against Carthage.[41] Propertius, for example, refuses to sing of Xerxes' yoking of the Hellespont (2.1.22). The author of the *Culex* provides a more detailed rejection, devoting the majority of his *recusatio* (24-34) to a rejection of an epic on the Persian Wars, mentioning the burning of Athens, the channel dug at Athos, and the yoking of the Hellespont (30-4).[42] Marcus Manilius also provides a detailed rejection of epic themes (5-26), again devoting the most detail to the theme of the Persian Wars, alluding to the Persians' massive army and navy, Athos, and the Hellespont (*Astronomica* 19-21).

Although neither Choerilus nor his *Persica* are explicitly mentioned, the level of detail, in particular that of the *Culex* and Manilius' *Astronomica*, suggests that the poets are alluding to a particular poem. Coming in the midst of a catalogue of other epic poems,

---

explicitly reject the possibility of three distinct poems. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (*SH* 314) reserve judgment: "'carmina barbarica, id est Medica et Persica'? aut 'carmina Barbarica et Medica et Persica'?," "the *Barbarian Song*, that is, *The Medes and the Persians*? or "the songs, *The Barbarians*, and *The Medes*, and *The Persians*?."

[39] Alfred Körte reads Βαρβαρικά as the main title and Μηδικά and Περσικά as titles of sections in the poem ("Literarische Texte mit Ausschlüss der christlichen," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 7 [1924]: 116-7).

[40] Huxley 1969b, 14-15.

[41] A.S. Hollis, "The Reputation and Influence of Choerilus of Samos," *ZPE* 130 (2000): 14.

[42] The *Culex* was transmitted along with the works of Virgil and purports to be the *iuvenilia* of Virgil. Virgilian authorship, however, has been convincingly rejected. Eduard Fraenkel argues that the internal evidence of the text demonstrates a dependence on the *Aeneid*, Virgil's last work. Fraenkel then dates the

it is most likely that the poem alluded to is an epic. Choerilus' *Persica*, a known epic on the Persian Wars, is a logical candidate. This identification is supported by the similarities between the *Persica* and the allusions in the Latin poets. The *Persica* narrated the yoking of the Hellespont, the various land and sea battles of the Wars, and drew a distinction between the East and the West. All three Augustan poets allude to the yoking of the Hellespont, Manilius hints at the land and sea fronts of the Persian Wars, while the *Culex* alludes to the channel dug at Athos to permit the movement of the Persian fleet. Furthermore, the *Culex*, with its mention of "Oriens," "the East," implies that a distinction was made between East and West. The *Persica*'s popularity at Athens and the *Suda*'s title τὴν 'Αθηναίων νίκην κατὰ Ξέρξου (the *Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes*), suggest an Athenian slant to the poem. Such a focus could account for the *Culex*' reference to the burning of the citadels of Erichthonius. Presumably such a poem would focus on the Athenians' accomplishments, and could enhance these accomplishments by describing the formidable obstacles, including the destruction of their city, that the Athenians overcame during the Wars; the temporal distance from the burning of Athens could allow for its narration, especially if the poem narrated it in such a way as to enhance the courage and sacrifice of the Athenians. The comparatively cursory rejections of mythological topics by these same authors suggest not only that the *Persica* was well-known even into the Augustan Age but also that the *Persica* was considered representative of Greek historical epic.

Although the complete text of the *Persica* is lost, what remains can, in combination with the secondary evidence, allow us to draw some conclusions regarding

---

Culex to no earlier than the reign of Tiberius (AD 14-37) based on its similarities to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* ("The Culex," *JRS* 42 [1952]: 1-9).

the scope and content of the poem, as well as its place within the poetic tradition and that of the Persian Wars.

THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE *PERSICA*

The preserved fragments of the *Persica*, the allusions to the poem in the Augustan poets, and the tradition of similarities between it and Herodotus' *Histories*, suggest that the poem is lengthy, complete with extensive descriptions and ethnographic detail. The preserved fragments are further evidence for the length of the *Persica*. Josephus preserves an excerpt from a catalogue of those Persian troops who fought under Xerxes (*contra Apionem* 1.172-4) in which Choerilus devotes five lines to a description of the appearance, language and homeland of one company (*SH* 320).[43]

Choerilus provides a colourful capsule sketch of only one of the tribes whom the Greeks will face, highlighting the fearsome appearance of this group (γένος θαυμαστὸν ἰδέσθαι, "a race terrible to behold") and so the threat which they present to the Greek forces; in turn, by defeating so terrible a threat, the glory of the victors is enhanced. The phrase that introduces the description, τῶν δ' ὄπιθεν, "after them," indicates that it forms part of a catalogue of forces; this is confirmed by the context provided by

---

[43] See also Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* 9.9. Josephus identifies this tribe as Jews since the Solyman Mountains mentioned in the fragment are in Jewish territory. Most scholars reject this (e.g., T. Reinach, ed. *Josephus: Contre Apion* [Paris: Belles Lettres, 1930], 33 n.4 and Huxley 1969b, 18). Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983) concur, noting that the hairstyle ascribed to the forces is forbidden to Jews by Leviticus 19.27 and Jeremiah 9.25. This does not argue decisively against Josephus' identification of the troops. Josephus, born in Jerusalem to a priestly family and sufficiently acquainted with Jewish laws to rise in the temple hierarchy to the position of ambassador to Rome, would be more familiar with the rites and customs permitted to Jews than we are today. It is, of course, possible that Josephus was over-eager in his determination to locate early references to his people, and thus to indicate their contribution to history. Franz Dornseiff defends Josephus' identification arguing that Phoenician speech indicates Semitic speech, accepting the equation of the Solyman Mountains with Jerusalem, and suggestion that the forbidden hairstyle is a mark of assimilation (*Echtheitsfragen antik-grieschischer literatur: rettungen des Theognis, Phokylides, Hekataios,*

Josephus. To gauge from the detail inherent in the description of only one division of the Persian forces, it is likely that other groups in the Persian army received comparable treatment. Choerilus is unlikely to have singled out only one band in Xerxes' massive force for mention, especially since his mention of the fearsome sight of this one group suggests that he was setting out the odds the Greeks would face and, ultimately, defeat. With his catalogue of the Greek and Persian forces, Choerilus positions himself within the epic tradition, echoing the Homeric catalogue of the forces at Troy (*Il.* 2.494-877).[44]

The narration of the gathering of the Persian forces was extensive; this in turn suggests that the rest of the poem was equally detailed, since Choerilus is unlikely to have spent more time, in a poem narrating the Persian Wars, on descriptions of the combatants than on the battles themselves. It is likely that the marshaling of the Persian troops was balanced by a description of the marshaling of the Greek forces, as the poet set out both sides in the epic battle, providing not only the image of the formidable obstacles the Persians presented, but also highlighting the skill and bravery of the Greeks who faced and defeated this same threat. From his catalogue of the forces arrayed against the Greeks, Choerilus would then have turned to narrate the battles against these foes.

The extent of the events the *Persica* described is disputed. The earlier poems of Simonides, Aeschylus, presumably, Phrynichus, and the later poem of Timotheus, were limited in scope to individual and discrete episodes from the Wars. While several of Simonides' elegies, written shortly after the events they describe, combine narrative with lamentation of the fallen and consolation of their kin, Aeschylus' *Persae* (and,

---

Choirilos [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1939], 67). That Josephus offers his analysis of the fragment, but not the explicit identification of the tribe, indicates that Choerilus did not in fact name this group as Jews.

[44] For an analysis of the Catalogue of Ships, see G.S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary* vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 167-263.

presumably, Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*) and Timotheus' *Persians*, all narrate the events at a distance from the events themselves, each offering an account of the battles and, ultimately, the victory, rather than a memorial to the combatants. The general tendency has been to interpret the *Persica*, which was also composed at a similar temporal and spatial distance and with a similar programme, on analogy with its predecessors. The consensus has been that it too must have narrated events only from the campaign of Xerxes rather than events from both invasions.[45] A close examination of the extant fragments suggests that the *Persica* had a much more extensive theme and treated not only the invasion of Xerxes but also the earlier invasion of Darius; it may also have included reference to, if not narration of, Darius' preliminary excursions.[46] Choerilus' implicit claim to originality for his work could then refer to both its content and its form. I will now examine the content.

I: THE CAMPAIGNS OF DARIUS

The *Persica* was a multi-book epic, consisting of at least two or possibly at least four books. The evidence for the number of books stems from a reference in Herodian. In a discussion of the use of "arethusa" to mean "spring" (*Π. μον. λεξ.* II) Herodian excerpts from Choerilus a simile in which a band of warriors who have stopped by a spring are likened to a swarm of bees (*SH* 318); he then specifies that the simile came from the first book of the *Persica* (ἐν α′ τῶν Περσικῶν). The specification "the first book" necessitates at least a second book. It is, however, possible that the excerpt came from the fourth book rather than from the first. A. Meineke has proposed emending the text to read ἐν δ′ τῶν Περσικῶν, "in the fourth book..." Although it has proved impossible to trace this reference and so Meineke's reasons for the proposed emendation, it is possible to speculate as to what his rationale might have been.[47] In many Greek scripts, Δ′ is an easy paleographic correction for A′; the position of the crossbar is easily mistakable both to an ancient copyist and to a modern editor attempting to read an ancient manuscript. Similarly, α′ and δ′ are easily mistakable. Λ′ or λ′ are other possibilities, albeit more remote ones since Choerilus is unlikely to have filled ten books before arriving at the march of Xerxes' troops in the eleventh.

---

[45] This is implicit in Naeke's identification of the *Persica* as *carmen de Xerxe*, and in the headings under which Lloyd-Jones and Parsons group the fragments: *SH* 318-20 *de Xerxis exercitu*; *SH* 319-20 *Hellesponti transitus*.

Furthermore, the content of the fragment suggests that the event it describes comes from a book later than the first. The simile likening troops to a swarm of bees surrounding a river is most readily recognizable as a reference to the troops of Xerxes rather than those of Darius. Darius' troops were spared the grueling march from Asia, having been ferried across into Europe (Hdt. 6.95). According to Herodotus, who is allowed some exaggeration in the David and Goliath story of the Persian Wars, Xerxes' expedition was so massive that it drank dry whole rivers in its march from Asia through Europe (7.43). While we ought not to accept this anecdote, or any other description of the forces arrayed against the Greeks, as the literal truth, it does point to the popular perception of the size of the army the Greeks faced, providing a basis for the simile. The simile is applicable to the campaign of Xerxes, which would suggest that, even if the *Persica* included the adventures of Xerxes alone, the narrative had nonetheless advanced

---

[46] The *Persica* "may well have been of a rather wider compass than Suidas' title would suggest, though there are no indications of this in the few surviving fragments" (Grenfell and Hunt 1915, 245).

beyond the first book. Events that might precede Xerxes' march could include his decision to invade, the construction of the boat bridge across the Hellespont (a popular element in the story of Xerxes' invasion), and the digging of the channel at Athos (alluded to in the *Culex*). Darius' campaign against the Greeks may also have preceded Xerxes' march.

The theory that the *Persica* included Darius' invasion is debated. Nevertheless, I think that it was included. Although Darius and the events of his campaign against the Greeks do not appear in any of the extant fragments of the *Persica*, textual evidence suggests that they were included. The context of one of the preserved fragments explicitly indicates Darius' presence. Strabo, in his description of the Scythians, cites Ephorus who, in his discussion of the lifestyle of the Scythians, supplies a quotation from Choerilus. Strabo prefaces this excerpt with the comment that it occurred ἐν τῇ διαβάσει τῆς σχεδίας, ἥν ἔζευξε Δαρεῖος, "in 'The Crossing of the Bridge,' which Darius yoked" (Strabo 7.3.9; =*FGrH* 70 F 42;=*SH* 319).[48]

The identification of the bridge, and hence the place of this fragment in the *Persica*, is disputed. The assignment of the fragment to the context of Xerxes' army over that of Darius' seems to derive from the preconception common to many authors that the *Persica* treated only Xerxes' invasion. Naeke blinkered most of his successors with his decisive statement "Ephorus nihil scripserat, nisi haec: Χοιρίλος ἐν τῇ διαβάσει τῆς

---

[47] This proposal appears in the *apparatus criticus* of every edition of Choerilus and is repeated in almost every work of criticism about Choerilus. Unfortunately, the bibliography is never given and examination of the most likely sources for this remark has been in vain.

[48] On analogy with Herodotus' reference to the *Aristeia of Diomedes* (ἐν Διομήδεος ἀριστείῃ [2.116.3]) "Crossing of the Bridge" appears to be the title of an episode in the *Persica*. Aelian preserves the most extensive list of individually-titled episodes from the Homeric poems, including such selections as the Battle at the Ships (τὴν ἐπὶ ναυσὶ μάχην) and the Catalogue of Ships (νεῶν κατάλογον) from the

σχεδίας Μηλονόμα etc. vel similiter," "Ephorus wrote nothing, except 'Choerilus in his crossing of the bridge' or something similar."[49] Naeke argues that Ephorus did not need to include Xerxes' name since it was obvious from the context; Strabo, whose mind was filled with Scythian matters, lacked the text of Choerilus and incorrectly inserted the phrase ἥν ἔζευξε Δαρεῖος, "which Darius yoked."

Naeke's theory suffers from *petitio principii* in that he assumes from the start that the *Persica* concerned itself solely with the second invasion (referring to it as *Choerili carmen de Xerxe*) and then uses this assumption to reject the explicit evidence of the text of Strabo. He also assumes fame for the *Persica* sufficient to cause Ephorus to omit the details of the context of his excerpt as superfluous to an audience incapable of thinking of any bridge other than that of Xerxes. He puts the blame for the appearance of Darius in the text squarely on the shoulders of Strabo who, with his mind filled with Scythian matters and lacking a text of Choerilus, supplied Darius as the instigator of the bridge that to earlier generations could only have signified that of Xerxes. Furthermore, Naeke provides no evidence or rationale for his assertion that Strabo had no text of Choerilus at hand. Darius' bridges constructed during his Scythian campaign were famous in their own right and figure prominently in the narrative of Herodotus, who records the reward bestowed upon the engineer and the monument erected by the engineer to commemorate

---

Iliad and the Story of the Cyclops (Κυκλώπειαν) and the Slaughter of the Suitors (μνηστήρων φόνον) of the *Odyssey* (*V.H.* 13.14).

[49] Naeke 1817, 126-9, esp. 128-9. Naeke was followed by F. Dübner (*Fragmenta Asii, Pisandri, Panyasidis, Choerili et Antimachi, post F.S. Lehrs, Hesiodi carmina* [Paris, 1841]) and G. Kinkel (*Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* I [Leipzig, 1877]). The text has been defended by A. Barigazzi ("Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel Proemio degli Aitia di Callimaco," *Hermes* 84 [1956]: 180), Huxley (1969b, 17) and Colace (1979 and "Note a Cherilo di Samo," in *Scritti in honore di Salvatore Pugliatti* vol. 5 *Scritti Vari* [Milan 1879], 829-30). A. Bernabé (1988) is more cautious, reporting the results of both camps.

his achievement (4.83-142). The explicit reference to Darius ought not to be so quickly rejected.

Naeke's conclusion has been influential. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons follow Naeke and reject the explicit statement of Strabo. They assign the fragment not to the context of Darius' actions, as the *prima facie* evidence would demand, but to the context of Xerxes' invasion, stating "aut ipse erravit aut interpolator," "either [Strabo] or else an interpolator erred" (*sub SH* 319). There is evidence from Herodotus for the association of Xerxes and the Scythians. In addition to 7.6.42, a detailed description of the Sacae in the catalogue of troops crossing the Hellespont with Xerxes, Herodotus records that the Scythians fought in Xerxes' navy (7.96.1) and at Plataea (9.31.4-5; 71.1); furthermore, Diodorus records their role at Thermopylae (11.7.2). Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, rejecting the evidence of the text of Strabo in favour of the facts as recorded by Herodotus and Diodorus, assign the fragment to the context of Xerxes' army (*de Xerxis exercitu*) and specifically to the crossing of the Hellespont (*hellesponti transitus*). Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, perhaps uncomfortable with Naeke's condemnation of the text of Strabo, suggest an interpolator as the culprit. It is, however, somewhat unlikely that this putative interpolator would have substituted the name of Darius for that of Xerxes, or that he would have added the less well-known bridge of Darius in favour of that of Xerxes.

The context of the fragment suggests that neither Strabo nor his interpolator was in error and that "Darius" is correctly transmitted. Ephorus, as cited by Strabo, was balancing the negative reports of the Scythians made by other authors with his own account of the lifestyle of the Scythian nomads who follow only the most just habits (7.3.9; [=*FGrH* 70 F42]). Ephorus then gave the results of their exemplary lifestyle, which included their remaining invincible and unconquered by foreigners (Strabo 7.3.9 [=*FGrH* 70 F42]). The quotation from the *Persica* follows immediately, which suggests that Ephorus cited this fragment in a discussion of the Scythians and their military record.

The fragment of the *Persica* does not explicitly identify the Sacae as allies of the Persians. Instead, it merely describes a culture discussed in the context of Darius yoking a river. Darius did attempt to conquer the Scythians and, during his unsuccessful invasion, he constructed bridges over both the Bosphorus and the Danube (Ister), thus "yoking" them (Hdt. 4.118). Herodotus mentions Darius' bridges throughout his description of the invasion of Scythia (4.83-142).[50] It is, therefore, possible that the reference to "yoking" comes from this context.

Nothing in the text of Choerilus precludes the Sacae's having fought with the Scythians, to which culture they belonged, against the invading Persians. Certain considerations, however, suggest that the troops described here are fighting with the Persians rather than against them. According to Herodotus, all Scythians are called Sacae (7.64.2). Darius is associated with the Sacae who are described as a subject province who owe him money and who may have been an ally during his invasion of Scythia.[51] As well, the Sacae fought on the side of the Persians at the battle of Marathon (Hdt. 6.113.1). The Scythians are as important to the efforts of Darius as they are to those of Xerxes; therefore, the quotation preserved in Strabo can come from a context in which Darius plays a role. This then suggests that Choerilus mentioned Darius' invasion of the Greek world, if not his earlier invasion of Scythia.

---

[50] For Darius' bridges, see specifically Hdt. 4.83.1, 4.85.2, 4.87 and 4.118; Strabo 7.3.15.

The opening lines of the *Persica* provide further evidence for the extent of the events covered by Choerilus suggesting that the poem was not limited to the activities of Xerxes: ἥγεό μοι λόγον ἄλλον, ὅπως 'Ασίης ἀπὸ γαίης / ἦλθεν ἐς Εὐρώπην πόλεμος μέγας, "tell me another story, how a great war came from Asia to Europe" (*SH* 316). Aristotle preserves these lines in his *Rhetoric* where he discusses the purpose of *exordia* in speeches and epic poetry, concluding that they provide the listener with the theme or topic of the piece (3.14.6). As evidence of explanatory prologues, he cites the first half lines of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, followed by these lines from Choerilus. Although he does not explicitly identify the author here, there is strong evidence that the author is Choerilus. Aristotle had a few sections earlier cited Choerilus by name as an example of an apologetic proem. Furthermore, the lines are hexametric, and the subject, the great war between Asia and Europe, is readily identifiable as the Persian Wars. Although the Trojan War was also conceived of as a great war between Asia and Europe and was recounted in epic, the Trojan War cannot be said to have come to Europe. Finally, there is a pronounced similarity here with the theme of Herodotus, an author with whom the anecdotal tradition suggests that Choerilus shares many stylistic and thematic affinities. These combined factors suggest the identification of the author of this fragment as Choerilus, and the poem as the *Persica*. The citation of these lines along with the opening lines of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* suggests they form the beginning of the *Persica*.[52]

---

[51] "Hdt. 4.88 'Amyrgian Sakai' were captured by Dareios soon after 520 in an eastern campaign beyond the Caspian... so Sakai could well have formed part of the imperial army in the Skythian campaign ca. 512" (Huxley 1969b, 17 n.19). See A.R. Burn, *Persia and the Greeks* [London: Edward Arnold, 1989], 103-4).

[52] Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983) read this as the first line since it follows the citation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; *contra* Colace who accepts Barigazzi's assertion (1956, 178) that the use of ἄλλος rather than

These lines announce the theme of the poem as the great war that came from Asia into Europe. Xerxes' invasion of the Greek world was not the first such occurrence and was perceived to be a continuation of his father's earlier expeditions and master plan. It was Darius' army that first crossed the Hellespont from Asia into Europe to wage war against Europe with the specific intention of taking Athens and Eretria (Hdt. 6.43.4).[53] Darius' initial foray was as unsuccessful as his second attempt which, supported by an equally large force, culminated in his defeat at the battle of Marathon.[54] His third attempt, cut off in the planning stage by his own untimely demise, was inherited by Xerxes who vowed to continue his father's revenge (Hdt. 7.8b.1-2).

Herodotus was not, of course, privy to the council of Xerxes in which the ruler announced his intent. Nonetheless Herodotus indicates the Greek view of the Persian invasions. For Herodotus, despite the decade between the two invasions, the Persian Wars were a totality rather than separate and discrete wars. This is indicated by his version of Xerxes' rationale for waging war against the Greeks and also by an explicit reference to the trials that resulted for the Greeks from the Persians (Hdt. 6.98.2), travails that started during the reign of Darius and continued through that of Artaxerxes as the Greek city-states jockeyed for position following their successes in the Wars.

ἕτερος "e indicativa del fatto che il frammento rappresente il proemio della terza parte dell' opera" (Colace 1979, 28).

[53] Herodotus provides an indication of the size of the naval contingent of the invasion force with his description of the casualties following the storm off Athos: Mardonius' fleet lost approximately three hundred ships and over twenty thousand men (6.44.3). We must not, of course, accept Herodotus' numbers at face value (see page 163). Herodotus mentions that many of those lost were either dashed on the rocks or devoured by monsters (sharks?) or drowned. For a similar emphasis on the inability of Persians to swim as indicative of the barbarian nature of the Persians, see Timotheus *Persians* 40-97 and E. Hall, "Drowning by nomes: the Greeks, Swimming and Timotheus' *Persians*," in *Birth of the European Identity: the Europe-Asia Contrast in Greek Thought 490-322 BC*, ed. H.A. Khan (Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 1994), 44-80.

[54] Darius' second powerful and well-equipped (πολλόν τε καὶ εὖ ἐσκευασμένον) force required six hundred ships for transport (Hdt. 6.95.1); but see page 163 for the reliability of Herodotus' numbers.

Herodotus helped to shape the popular conception of the Persian Wars. We can therefore accept his account as indicative of the view of some of his contemporaries and successors. Given the anecdotal tradition's linking of the historian with Choerilus, it is possible that Choerilus followed the lead of Herodotus and his conception of the Wars in his *Persica*. His theme, announced in the programmatic proem as the great war that came from Asia to Europe, most likely included the invasion of Darius, which started the Wars, as well as that of Xerxes, which ended them. It is, of course, impossible to determine the extent to which the two invasions were narrated.

The *Suda*'s title, τὴν ’Αθηναίων νίκην κατὰ Ξέρξου, the *Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes*, does not argue conclusively against the inclusion of the campaign of Darius in the *Persica*. Rather, the title may be an excerpt selected from a larger work. The title of Choerilus' epic is known more commonly by all-encompassing titles (*Persica*, *Perseidem*) that suggest a poem on Persian matters more widespread than Xerxes' campaigns and the Athenians' specific role in them.

Νίκη signifies victory, whether personal, such as athletic victories, or public, such as military ones. Its use by the *Suda* suggests that the excerpt from Choerilus' poem narrated one battle in particular. Since Thermopylae was a Spartan defeat and a battle in which the Athenians had no role, and Artemisium, although a tactical victory for the Athenians, resulted in heavy losses and had little immediate effect on the outcome of the War, we can discount them as the Victory in question.[55] The *Suda*'s title most readily suggests the battle of Salamis, a battle in which the Athenians figured prominently and one in which they took particular pride;[56] it was also the battle in which Xerxes personally witnessed the defeat that forced him from the Greek world and the almost complete destruction of his forces. The Athenian mind telescoped the second invasion into the battle of Salamis, transformed their role in that one battle into responsibility for the ultimate defeat of the Persians, and assumed sole credit for the removal of the Persian threat. The Athenian victory over Xerxes was popular and very well-known and could readily have become a favoured section of the larger *Persica*; the existence of such a title does not, therefore, guarantee that the *Persica* omitted the campaigns of Darius.

---

[55] Victory in battle is determined by which side holds the field at the end of the battle (W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, Part 2 [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974], 259-61).

Based on the number of books of the *Persica*, its opening lines, and the evidence of Strabo, we can perhaps conclude that Choerilus did include the campaigns of Darius.

II: THE CAMPAIGNS OF XERXES

The *Suda*'s title, "The Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes" confirms that the *Persica* did narrate the invasion of Xerxes. From the description of his song narrating "the great war which came from Europe to Asia" (*SH* 316) and from the considerable detail spent on a description of the troops engaged in the battles (*SH* 320) we can conclude that the various battles that made up Xerxes' invasion were narrated. If Callimachus did condemn Choerilus' *Persica* as an example of ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές, "one unbroken song," (*Aetia* fr. 1.3) we can perhaps infer that the battles were narrated in turn.[57] I will now consider the evidence for Choerilus' treatment of the individual battles and events of the Persian Wars under Xerxes.

---

[56] The words Thucydides puts into the mouths of the Athenian ambassadors to Sparta provides clear evidence for the Athenian conception of their role at Salamis and in the Wars themselves: they claim credit for making the greatest contribution to the battle (1.74.1) which single-handedly won the War (1.73.5). That Aeschylus and Timotheus, and perhaps Phrynichus, also wrote about the battle of Salamis for a largely Athenian audience indicates its importance to the Athenian consciousness, as does its use by the orators.

A: THE BATTLES OF ARTEMISIUM AND THERMOPYLAE

Although there are no identifiable fragments of the battle of Artemisium extant, we can infer its presence from the comment of the scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 1.211-5 (=*SH* 321); according to the scholiast, Choerilus said that Oreithyia was abducted from the Cephissian spring while picking flowers (Χοιρίλος δὲ ἁρπασθῆναί φησιν αὐτὴν ἄνθη ἀμέργουσαν ὑπὸ τὰς τοῦ Κηφισοῦ πηγάς). Two considerations allow us to conclude that this is a reference to the *Persica*. First, a discussion of the myth of Oreithyia, the wife and mother of the gods who helped the Athenians at Artemisium, is appropriate to the context of the Persian Wars.[58] Second, although the *Suda* ascribes "other poems" to Choerilus, there are no recognizable fragments of or references to any of these poems extant; more significantly, the biographical tradition firmly associates Choerilus with the Persian Wars. Although the biographical tradition's tendency to take the words of a poet as evidence for that poet's life makes the validity of the tradition's evidence somewhat suspect, we can accept their evidence in this instance with some degree of confidence: the biographical tradition preserves evidence that Choerilus wrote about and became famous because of his poem on the Persian Wars. These two factors would then suggest that the preserved fragments of Choerilus' poetry ought, in the first instance, be ascribed to his *Persica*, unless contrary evidence exists. Since there are no counter-indications in this instance, I think we can safely assign the reference to the abduction of Oreithyia to the *Persica.*

---

[57] Callimachus defends himself against charges of not writing "one unbroken song" (ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές [*Aetia* fr. 1.3 Pf]) of thousands of lines on the subject of Kings and heroes. Cameron rejects the reading "one unbroken song" as simply denoting epic. Instead, he reads it as a rejection of temporal, rather than thematic continuity or "continuous linear narrative" in which the poet narrates "one event after another without any structure or climax" (1995, 343).

[58] Compare Simonides' poem on the battle of Artemisium.

The picturesque detail of her picking flowers may imply an extended scene describing her abduction. The abduction of girls while picking flowers is a common poetic motif; we can compare Hades' abduction of Persephone (*Hom. Hymn Dem*. 1-20), Theseus' of Helen (Eur. *Helen* 243ff), Apollo's of Creusa (Eur. *Ion* 887-90) and Zeus' of Europa (Moschus *Europa*). Helene P. Foley examined the motif and concluded that such abductions indicate the girl's readiness for marriage.[59] Like Persephone, Creusa, and Europa, Oreithyia's abduction results in a sexual union and, as in the case of the latter two, in children.[60] By depicting Oreithyia's rape from a meadow while picking flowers, Choerilus may have been aligning himself with traditional poetry.

Since Choerilus wrote a lengthy epic on the Persian Wars and since Oreithyia, through her abduction by Boreas, was significant to the battle of Artemisium, we can infer that Choerilus, like Simonides, included the abduction of Oreithyia in his account of the battle of Artemisium.[61] If Choerilus wrote his *Persica* for an Athenian audience, it is likely that he included Athens' familial relationship with Boreas.[62]

There are no extant fragments indicative of the battle of Thermopylae and no anecdotal or testimonial evidence that suggests its presence. We can, however, plausibly conjecture that if Choerilus narrated the Persian Wars from the invasion of Darius to that of Xerxes, then he would have included the battle of Thermopylae. If Choerilus also included such ancillary material as the early campaigns of Cyrus, the inclusion of Thermopylae is more plausible.[63] Certainty is, however, impossible. If Choerilus did include an account of the battle of Thermopylae, his treatment of it would be significant for our understanding of the development of the theme of the Persian Wars: did Choerilus present a picture of the heroic last stand of the noble Spartans, or did he present a picture of a defeat, in contrast to the victories won by the Athenians?

---

[59] Helene P. Foley, ed., *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994). 33-4. And see N.J. Richardson, ed., *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974) 140-1.

[60] Persephone, the goddess of Death is, in most traditions barren; Helen was rescued by her brothers before such a union could take place.

[61] For Simonides' inclusion of Oreithyia, see page 60.

B: THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS

Xerxes' defeat at Salamis was likely narrated at some length, judging from the existence of the title *Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes*. Such an account would likely include a scene of Xerxes' reaction as he witnessed the defeat of his forces, a common element in accounts of the battle of Salamis. Herodotus includes a detailed, if restrained, description of Xerxes' actions from the early stages of the battle, where the King confidently records the names of those who distinguished themselves in the fighting, to its end where, having witnessed the defeat, he makes plans for his own retreat (8.86-103). Aeschylus' *Persae* is devoted to the anticipation of the imminent return of the defeated King to his grieving court, and the reception which awaited him there upon his arrival; the Messenger concludes his report of the disaster at Salamis with news of Xerxes' reaction (465-71) and Xerxes is forced to relive his despair for the Chorus who question him sharply upon his return (909-1078). Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* was set at the Persian court; based on the probability of strong similarities between it and Aeschylus' *Persae*, it

---

[62] This familial relationship is also found in Herodotus (7.189) and Pindar frr. 76-7 (Snell-Maehler).

[63] For the inclusion of the campaigns of Cyrus, see pages 185-192.

too likely included such a scene. Timotheus' *Persians* includes a vignette of Xerxes' reaction in which his lament over his defeat and the loss of his men quickly turns to a callous concern for his own safety and the safety of the wealth that had accompanied him.

On analogy with other accounts of Salamis, then, it is likely that Choerilus' *Persica* contained a scene depicting Xerxes' reaction to his defeat. Scholars have detected traces of such a scene in Athenaeus. As the characters in Athenaeus discuss the shapes and styles of drinking vessels and drinking habits, one proposes that they shun earthenware cups (παραιτητέον δ' ἡμῖν τὰ κεράμεα ποτήρια). In support of his suggestion (καὶ γάρ), he cites Ctesias who had indicated that among the Persians such cups were used by those whom the king wanted to dishonour: παρὰ Πέρσαις, φησίν, ὃν ἂν βασιλεὺς ἀτιμάσῃ, κεραμέοις χρῆται (*Deip.* 11.464 A; =*FGrH* 668 F 40).[64] The speaker then follows with a quotation from Choerilus as further support of the undesirability of clay cups:

> χερσὶν ὄλιζον ἔχω κύλικος τρύφος ἀμφὶς ἐαγός
> ἀνδρῶν δαιτυμόνων ναυάγιον, οἷά τε πολλὰ
> πνεῦμα Διωνύσοιο πρὸς ὕβριος ἔκβαλεν ἀκτάς
> I hold a potsherd in my hands, a cup broken about the edges,
> a shipwreck of guest-men, like the many wrecks that the breath of
> Dionysus casts up upon the headland of arrogance (*SH* 329).[65]

The juxtaposition of the quotation from Ctesias, describing uniquely Persian customs, with the quotation from a Choerilus, described as an epic poet (ἐποποιός), has led some to infer that the Choerilus is the Samian poet and that the fragment forms part of the *Persica*, specifically a scene in which Xerxes abases himself following his defeat at Salamis.

---

[64] Ctesias, a late-fifth-century or fourth-century Greek who served as physician as the court of Artaxerxes (405-359), was the author of a multi-book history of Persia (*FGrH* 688 F 1-44).

[65] The manuscript preserves χερσὶν ὄλβον. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons print the first two words as χερσὶν ὄλιζον (*SH* 329). Naeke (1817, fr. 8) prints χερσὶν † ὄλβον. Colace summarizes the many attempts to solve the metrical problem of a trochee in the first foot, which is unacceptable in a hexametric line, and proposes simply reversing the order of the words to read ὄλβον χερσὶν ("Un 'Locus desperatus' in Cherilo di Samo [fr. 8,1 N.]," *GIF* 27 [1975]: 278-9), and prints his emendation as his fr. 7 This emendation restores the hexameter; the error in transcription is readily explained by a simple scribal mistake. If we accept Colace's reading, the mention of "happiness" could perhaps be understood as sarcastic or ironic speech of the part of the speaker (Colace 1975, 280).

The poet in question is almost certainly Choerilus of Samos. Since the lines are hexametric and Choerilus identified as an epic poet, we can reject the tragedian Choerilus of Athens. The epic poet Choerilus of Iasus is a much less likely possibility. Only one fragment of Choerilus of Iasus, who was universally derided as a wretched poet, is ever cited by anybody, and while Athenaeus does quote this fragment (8.335e), he does so without naming Choerilus. Instead, he cites the fragment through its parody by Chrysippus of Soli (*SH* 338), showing no sign that he knew the source of the original. When Athenaeus quotes the fragment in which we are interested (*SH* 329) he ascribes it to Choerilus the epic poet, which suggests that he knew of only one Choerilus; of the two epic poets, the Samian was the better known, had a far superior reputation, and was more often cited, which makes him far more likely to be identified simply as "the epic poet" rather than the execrable Choerilus of Iasus.[66] We are therefore justified in concluding that the author of our fragment is Choerilus of Samos.

It is equally likely that the fragment comes from Choerilus' *Persica*. Although the imagery of the fragment does suggest a sympotic poem, the successive hexameters guarantee that it is not: it was permissible to compose sympotic poems in elegiac couplet but not in hexameters. If the fragment is from Choerilus of Samos, it is likely from the *Persica*, Choerilus' most famous poem and the basis of his later reputation.[67] The *Persica* is most often quoted by the sources, and although there is the suggestion that he wrote other poems, there are no secure titles known and no identifiable fragments extant.

---

[66] Athenaeus identifies Choerilus of Samos as "the epic poet" at 8.345d; see page 148.

[67] See pages 143-148.

Athenaeus does not explicitly indicate how the quotation from Choerilus was meant to support the contention that clay cups are to be avoided, but the context suggests that the quotation is to be understood in light of the preceding quotation from Ctesias. It is possible that he cites the lines as a further reason to avoid clay cups—not only are they a sign of disgrace among the Persians (Ctesias), they can break (Choerilus)—but one would expect him to made some overt indication of the shift in logic. Since Athenaeus provides no explanation of how the Choerilus quotation furthers the argument that clay cups are bad, it is logical to conclude that the Choerilus fragment furthers the point of the Ctesias fragment, namely that the use of such cups was considered a disgrace among the Persians. Certainly, the initial point about the unsuitability of earthenware cups is not meant to be an absolute argument, as the speaker immediately proceeds to remark that in fact, clay cups can be very pleasant (ἐγὼ δὲ εὖ οἶδα ὅτι ἥδιστα πολλάκις ἐστὶ τὰ κεράμεα ἐκπώματα [11.464b]) and describes several benefits from their use. This would suggest that breakage alone would not account for the reluctance of the speaker to use them. In any case, it seems a remarkable coincidence for Athenaeus to add directly after a quotation from a work of Persian history another, unexplained quotation from a second author whose only known work is a famous hexametric poem dealing with a Persian topic, if the second quotation had nothing to do with Persians. When we further consider that Choerilus elsewhere in the fragments of the *Persica* evinces an interest in ethnographic details, then it becomes reasonable to imagine that Athenaeus derived the two quotations about Persian affairs from some intermediate source that associated separate quotations from two disparate sources that happened to mention the same topic.[68] Certainty is of course impossible since Athenaeus does not indicate anything about the context of the Choerilus fragment, but the elaborated juxtaposition associating *hubris*, broken cups, and maritime imagery directly after a fragment from Ctesias that indicates the disgrace among the Persians of drinking from earthenware cups suggests that the Choerilus fragment related to the same custom.

If the lines are in fact from the *Persica*, and they do refer to the custom described by Ctesias, the question then becomes: what do they describe? Hermann proposed that the fragment be read as the words of a disgraced Xerxes, following his defeat at Salamis; this suggestion found favour with Kinkel.[69] Huxley also accepts this identification and, in support, offers a parallel from Herodotus' account of the battle, citing the similarity of the wind blowing wreckage towards the shore (8.96.2); Huxley then suggests that "the wrecks of the ships are compared to the damaged vessels after a violent drinking party."[70] Colace concurs, noting the mixture of sympotic and maritime imagery, but arguing that the maritime elements dominate. He cites the appropriateness of the maritime imagery (ναυάγιον, "shipwreck," ἀκτάς, "headland" and ἐαγός, "shattered") to Salamis and the sentiments expressed by the speaker to a disgraced Xerxes.[71]

M.L. West, however, in his review of Colace's edition, dismisses the idea as "far-fetched" and, although I suspect that some scene involving Xerxes' reaction to the defeat was included in the *Persica*, I agree with West that this fragment does not derive from it.[72] As West states, the similarities to wind blowing wreckage following the battles of Artemisium and Salamis are irrelevant to the identification of this fragment. Furthermore, there are grammatical and contextual considerations that prevent us from assigning these words to a defeated Xerxes.

---

[68] In *SH* 319 and 320 Choerilus discusses respectively the Scythian Sacae and (most likely) Jews (see n. 43).

[69] Hermann is cited by Kinkel on fr. 9: "Haec a Xerxe victo dici potuisse observavit Hermann," "Hermann noted that this could be said by a defeated Xerxes."

[70] Huxley 1969b, 23. Compare W.J. Slater, "Symposium at Sea," *HSCP* 80 (1976): 161-70 who reads the fragment as representing symposiasts, who liken their symposium to a "noisy shipwreck" (163).

[71] Colace 1979, 66.

That the fragment does not refer to the situation following the Persians' defeat at Salamis is suggested by the phrase οἷά τε . . . ἔκβαλεν. The unaugmented aorist may be a gnomic aorist, which would represent a general truth.[73] The verb, in conjunction with οἷά τε, refers to a general and not a specific situation.[74] The force of οἷά τε . . . ἔκβαλεν means that the speaker comments not on the ruin that followed the specific situation of Salamis, but rather on the general tendency the spirit of Dionysus has to ruin those who behave arrogantly.

Furthermore, there is nothing in the text to indicate that the speaker is Xerxes and in fact the content of the fragment suggests that he is not. If the two quotations in Athenaeus are linked and Choerilus does exemplify Ctesias' contention that whoever the King wants to dishonour is forced to drink from a clay cup, then to see the speaker as Xerxes, we must assume that the Great King wanted to dishonour himself publicly, and that when he took up a broken cup for this purpose, he called attention to his action. Aeschylus and Timotheus present a king who abased himself publicly and certainly it was not impossible for a Greek author to create a less-than-historically accurate Persian king.[75] Nevertheless, Herodotus, with whom Choerilus was thought to have many similarities, does not portray such a King. His Xerxes does not humiliate himself but rather remains firmly in control of his emotions and his subjects, dispatching news of the defeat to Susa, arranging for the continuing of the War, and making plans for his own retreat. Finally, it would require a shift of scene to Persia following the battle. While this is not impossible, it is unlikely since it seems somewhat anticlimactic in a poem narrating the Greek victory to shift from the battlefield and a scene of that victory to the Persian court for a scene of Persian dishonour.

---

[72] M.L. West, review of *Choerili Samii quae supersunt*, ed. P. Radici Colace, *CR* 31 (1981): 105. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons are equally unconvinced, assigning the fragment to the *dubia* of Choerilus of Samos but allowing the possibility that they belong to Choerilus of Iasus (*SH* 329).

[73] William W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (New York: St. Martin's, 1965), § 154-5; see also William W. Goodwin and Charles B. Gulick, *Greek Grammar* (1930; reprint, New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1992), §1293.

Thus, both the context as given by Ctesias and the content of the fragment suggest a banquet scene rather than a naval scene. Although the terms ναυάγιον, "shipwreck," ἀκτάς, "headland," and ἐαγός, "shattered," are indications of maritime imagery, they are not restricted to such a context. Although Colace argues that ἄγνυμι, "to break, shatter," "è un verbo che viene spesso impiegato per indicare l'infrangersi della nave," and cites several Homeric examples to support his argument, the word is also used frequently in other contexts, from shattered shields and swords (e.g. *Il.* 7.270 and 3.367), to broken trees (*Il.* 16.769), to a broken, or "winding," stream (Hdt. 1.185).[76] The word ναυάγιον can suggest sympotic imagery; the context supports this.[77] Furthermore, the speaker refers not simply to ναυάγιον, "shipwreck" but rather to ἀνδρῶν δαιτυμόνων

---

[74] Denniston observes ,"it is to be noted that almost all the examples [of τε with a relative] denote habitual, typical action. The tense is almost always present, or gnomic aorist" (1954, 521); see also s.v. τε (iii) οἵός τε and Goodwin and Gulick, 1930, § 1024b.

[75] Compare the behaviour of Aeschylus' Xerxes following his defeat at Salamis (*Pers.* 465-70) and his costume and demeanour upon his arrival at Susa (908-end), and Timotheus' Xerxes (*Persians* 465-71; see page 249).

[76] Colace 1979, 67.

[77] For the conflation of sympotic and maritime imagery, see Slater 1976, 161-70.

ναυάγιον, "shipwreck of guestmen." It is unlikely that Xerxes would have referred to himself as a "guestman" in Greece since so far from being there as a guest, for the purpose of feasting and friendship, he was present as an enemy, for the purpose of hostilities and conquest. Finally, ἀκτάς here does not signify a physical headland but rather a metaphorical one, the abstract concept, *hubris*, upon which one's efforts can founder.

The wreckage is blown onto the metaphorical headland of *hubris* not by any maritime wind, but rather by the spirit of Dionysus, πνεῦμα Διωνύσοιο. While Colace may associate πνεῦμα with the sea, his attempts to account for the presence of Dionysus in a maritime context are forced. He makes reference to epithets of Dionysus found in Nonnus (fl. AD 450-70): θαλασσόμοθος, "fighting with the sea," (*Dion.* 36.421, 39.407, and 43.359); and θαλασσοπόρος, "seafaring," (*Dion.* 21.187).[78] The late date of Nonnus makes the validity of his evidence to the interpretation of the fragment of Choerilus doubtful. Nonnus was unknown to Choerilus and the epithets in Nonnus are not found in any authors contemporary with Choerilus or in those who had preceded him.[79] While it is possible that the epithets in Nonnus preserve evidence of a tradition contemporary with Choerilus but otherwise lost, there is no evidence to suggest this. Colace also alludes to parallels between Poseidon and Dionysus. Nevertheless, any perceived relationship between the two gods notwithstanding, in the Classical period Dionysus was not known as a god of the sea.[80] Furthermore, there is nothing to associate

---

[78] Colace 1979, 69.

[79] *LSJ* cite only Nonnus for θαλασσόμοθος and only the third-century Theaetetus and the fifth- to sixth-century AD Museus for θαλασσοπόρος.

[80] One text that does associate Dionysus with the sea is the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*, in which the god takes vengeance on pirates who seek to rob him. It should be noted that even in this maritime story Dionysus is in his element as god of wine, turning the boat into a vineyard.

Dionysus with the battle of Salamis. Instead, Dionysus is primarily the god of wine and intoxication, and it is in this guise that his presence in the fragment must be read. Finally, the wreckage is that of "guestmen" and not sailors. These factors argue for a sympotic setting, in which Dionysus is at home, over a maritime one.

The spirit of Dionysus can be read as intoxication, which has caused the ruin of a guestman through arrogance. West found a parallel for the phrase πνεῦμα Διωνύσοιο, in Euenus of Paros, the fifth-century rhetorician and elegist, who refers to the intoxicating effects of the winds of Bacchus (*IEG*^{2} 2). Like all Greek gods, Dionysus is vengeful and swift to punish arrogance. The phrase οἷά τε . . . ἔκβαλεν could then refer to Dionysus' general tendency to punish those who overstep their bounds. A possible interpretation of the fragment, then, is that the speaker, in a Persian setting, laments the public humiliation (being forced to drink from the pottery cup) that he incurred through arrogance deriving from his drunkenness.

Although I reject the identification of the speaker as Xerxes following the battle of Salamis, it is perhaps not necessary to reject the fragment as forming part of the *Persica*. It is tempting to see the speaker as a nobleman at a banquet who, having offended Xerxes, is forced to drink from a broken cup as an act of public humiliation.[81] It is even more tempting to suggest that the nobleman, under the influence of Dionysus, angered Xerxes by giving unwelcome and presumptuous advice concerning the war.[82] This is, of course, speculation, based on evidence that is suggestive rather than conclusive. If I am *correct*, however, we can perhaps infer that the *Persica* included the preliminaries to the invasion and scenes at the Persian court. This would mesh with the tradition that Choerilus shared many traits, including ethnographic details, with Herodotus in whose *Histories* such elements are found. In addition, we could suggest that Choerilus created his Barbarians, at least in part, like Greeks. Symposia were an institution of the Greek aristocracy. If the fragment does depict a symposium among the Persians, Choerilus may have presented a scene of hellenized Persians.[83]

---

[81] It must be noted that the fragment does not refer explicitly to a pottery cup; instead, it refers to a broken cup. That the broken cup is made from pottery is inferred from its friability.

Another fragment which can been claimed, albeit tentatively for the *Persica* is *PMichaelidae* 5.[84] The papyrus preserves a hexametric account of a naval battle between Greeks and Persians; the battle may be Salamis. D.S. Crawford infers the presence of Artemis at Salamis from Plutarch's *de malign. Her.* 37, where Plutarch refers to Themistocles' plan to fight at Salamis and set up a temple to Artemis Aristoboules ("of good counsel"). From this, Crawford concludes that there was an epiphany of Artemis prior to the battle.[85] He supports this with three references in the papyrus text suggesting Artemis' presence: παρθέ]νον ἁγνὴν, "holy virgin" (col. 1.16); παρθένος οὐρανί[η, "heavenly virgin" (col. 2.7); and λητοῦς (col. 1.18) which may indicate Artemis' mother, Leto.

Crawford's argument is rather circular and rests primarily on the restored words of the papyrus fragment. There are, however, other considerations that strengthen

---

[82] Herodotus, for example, records several anecdotes in which the King vents his anger and takes vengeance on those who displease him: e.g., 7.35 (the sea); 7.39-40.1 (Pythius the Lydian); and 7.238 (Leonidas).

[83] For Timotheus' use of sympotic imagery to enhance the Barbarian nature of the Persians, see pages 243-245.

[84] The papyrus contains excerpts from a variety of poems, some identified, some not. D.S. Crawford has suggested that the papyrus is either a school exercise or else a privately-made anthology (*Papyri Michaelidae. Being a Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri, Tablets, and Ostraca in the Library of Mr. G.A. Michailidis of Cairo*, ed. D.S. Crawford [Aberdeen, 1955], 13). Crawford hesitantly ("it is tempting to suppose") suggests Choerilus as the author. Colace relegates the papyrus to an appendix in his edition, while Lloyd-Jones and Parsons assign it to the "Adespota" (*SH* 904-5).

Crawford's identification. Col. 1.24-5 may read ἵ]κετο κῆρυξ / Μ]ήδοις, "a herald came to the Medes," which could be a reference to Themistocles' ruse to ensure that the battle was fought on his terms: the night before the battle, Themistocles sent a false messenger to the Persians, claiming that the Greeks were on the verge of retreating; Xerxes then drew up his forces to prevent the Greeks' retreat, forcing the battle to be fought at Salamis exactly as Themistocles had planned (Hdt. 8.75). Col. 1.21 alludes to a distinction made between Greece and Asia, (Ἑλ]λάδι πάσηι, "all Greece"); this supports assigning the fragment to the *Persica*. It echoes the *Persica*'s first line with its distinction between Europe and Asia and it is likely that such a contrast was present beyond the first line. Unfortunately, this remains speculative.

It is likely that the battle of Salamis was narrated in the *Persica*; the poem was composed for an Athenian audience and it would be inconceivable for an Athenian poem on the Persian Wars to omit Athens' greatest victory in them. While we cannot conclude that the *Persica* presented a picture of Xerxes disgracing himself following his defeat (fr. 7 Colace), we can conclude that Choerilus offered Athens sufficient praise to warrant the subheading "the Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes" and to win himself honour at Athens.[86]

C: THE SACKING OF ATHENS

Whether or not Choerilus included the sacking of Athens is debated. In support of its inclusion, we have the author of the *Culex* who, in his refusal to write an epic on the Persian Wars, states "urit Ericthonias Oriens non ignibus arces," "the East does not burn

---

[85] Crawford 1955, 14.

[86] On Choerilus' honour at Athens, see page 209.

the Erichthonian citadels" (30). Since the author is refering to an epic treatment of the Persian Wars, we can infer that he is referring to that of Choerilus. Certainly, the sacking of Athens could be an unpopular topic in Athens, if handled in such a way as to denigrate Athens or to imply its defeat. Aeschylus denied its effectiveness in his *Persae* (348-9), while Timotheus seems to have omitted it altogether, ending the Wars with the Athenian victory at Salamis.[87] Nevertheless, Herodotus did include the fate of Athens in his *Histories* (8.52-3; 9.13) and Choerilus was thought to have been influenced by the historian. It is possible that he too included the sacking of Athens; it is also possible that he did so in such a way as to diminish the Persians' actions and enhance the response of the Athenians in the face of adversity. Furthermore, both Herodotus and Choerilus wrote at some distance from the events, while Aeschylus wrote a scant seven years after them, for an audience of those who had recently endured the Wars. The temporal distance of Choerilus and his audience may have allowed the emotional distance necessary to permit the inclusion of the sacking of Athens, albeit necessarily in a way that reflected well on Athens.

III: THE CAMPAIGNS OF CYRUS

In addition to the campaigns of Darius and Xerxes in the Persian Wars, it is possible that Choerilus included reference to, if not narration of, the campaigns of Cyrus, the Persian king who overthrew his Median overlord, thus adding Media to the Persian Empire. Evidence for his inclusion in the *Persica* may be lurking in the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*. In an invective against the Telchines, a group of benighted literary critics,[88] Callimachus provides an outline of his own literary aesthetic that rejects the long poem and common themes. In the course of his denunciation of inferior literary ideals, Callimachus states

---

[87] On Aeschylus' denial of the effectiveness of the sacking of Athens, see pages 133-135.

> ἐπὶ Θρηΐκας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτοιο [πέτοιτο
> αἵματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη [γ]έρα[νος,
> Μασσα⌋γέται ⌊καὶ⌋ μακ⌊ρὸν ὀϊστεύ⌋οιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα
> Μῆδον][89]
>
> Let the crane, delighting in Pygmy blood, fly to Thrace
> from Egypt, and let the Massagetes shoot arrows against
> the Mede, at a great distance (*Aetia* fr. 1.13-16 Pf.).

Callimachus' dismissal of the crane and the Massagetes follows his judgment on the merits of the long versus the short poetry of Mimnermus, and the relative success of each: τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν /......] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή, "of his two types of poetry, the small ones and not the *Big Woman* taught that Mimnermus is sweet," (*Aetia* fr. 1.11-12).[90] Since the *Big Woman* is a reference to a specific poem by a particular author, it is likely that Callimachus continues to dismiss bad poetry in the subsequent images of the crane and the Massagetes by specific reference to particular poems.[91]

---

[88] The Telchines were an ancient and obscure race of metalworkers with a reputation as spiteful and jealous sorcerers (Strabo, 14.654; Ovid, *Met.* 7.365-6). Callimachus, with his penchant for saying things in the most allusive and clever way possible, adopts this as a pejorative term for his literary enemies, describing them as a βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος, "a malignant and murderous race" (*Aetia* fr. 1.17) and νήιδες ... Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι, "ignorant and not beloved of the Muse" (*Aetia* fr. 1.2). The Florentine scholia to this passage provide the names of some likely suspects: the Hellenistic poets Asclepiades and Posidippus, and Praxiphanes of Mytilene (see R. Pfeiffer, ed., *Callimachus*, vol. 1 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1949], 3). Lefkowitz dismisses this anecdote as typical biographical criticism (1981, 120-1). For a defense of the names and the actual existence of enemies see Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 185-225 and 229-32.

[89] Pfeiffer (1949) supplies Μῆδον based on Herodotus' account of the death of Cyrus and the greater part of the Medes at the hands of the Massagetes (1.214).

[90] My translation is guided by Allen's discussion of this passage (1993, 23-6). Compare Cameron 1995, 307-11.

[91] Barigazzi 1956, 168-9; see also P.E. Eichgrün, *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios* (Berlin, 1961), 73-7, and, (more tentatively) Huxley, 1969b, 15: "The emphasis on size, Medes, Persians and remote barbarians is worthy of remark; indeed might not Choirilos, the butt of Istros the Kallimachean, be one of the poets whom Kallimachus attacks here?".

Since Choerilus wrote hexametric poetry and was, along with Antimachus whom Callimachus explicitly condemned,[92] one of the two leading representatives of epic poetry at the end of the fifth century responsible for its revival, Callimachus could therefore be expected to include Choerilus in his condemnation of epic style.[93] Barigazzi sees the reference to the flight of the cranes as an allusion, in Callimachus' typical allusive and erudite fashion, to Darius' conquest of the region of Thrace between the Aegean Sea and the Danube. This region was rich in cranes and was considered to be the homeland of those birds that waged war against the Pygmies living along the Nile.[94] The mention of the Massagetes and their battle against the Persians would be a reference to the expedition of Cyrus against them, which resulted in the rise to power of the Persian Empire (Hdt. 1.201-16).[95] On Barigazzi's reading of the prologue of the *Aetia*, in the *Persica* Choerilus would have recounted not only the invasion of Europe by Xerxes, but also that by Darius (signified by the cranes), as well as earlier expeditions of Cyrus (signified by the Massagetes).

As support for Barigazzi's theory, Bernabé offers a comment by a scholiast on Virgil *Georgics* 1.482: "ubi enim Eridanus sit, multi errant...Choerilus in Germania, in quo flumine Phaethon extinctus est," "many people are mistaken as to the location of the Eridanus; Choerilus places it, the river in which Phaëthon died, in Germany" (*SH* 332).[96]

---

[92] Callimachus considered Antimachus' *Lyde*, a narrative elegy in two books recounting various mythological episodes likely linked by the theme of unhappy love, to be παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν, "a thick poem and not clear" (fr. 398Pf.).

[93] Barigazzi 1956, 168-9.

[94] Barigazzi 1956, 179-80. The Geranomachy is first mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 3.3-6); from the sixth century on, it was a popular subject in Greek and Roman art and literature (Véronique Dasen, "Pygmaioi," in *LIMC* [Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1994], vol. 7.1: 594-601 and vol. 7.2: 466-86.

[95] Barigazzi 1956, 178-9.

[96] A. Bernabé, "Quérilo y la Geranomaquia. Sobre el fr. 13 Colace (=14 Kinkel =*SH*. 332)," *Emerita* 52 (1984): 319.

The identification of this Choerilus divides itself along party lines, with editors of epic accepting Naeke's assertion that it is the Samian, editors of tragedy favouring the Athenian, and the editors of the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* favouring the Samian, but allowing the possibility, albeit a remote one, that the Choerilus in question is the Iasian.[97]

Naeke favoured the Samian, seeing the suitability of a parallel between the fates of Phaëthon and Xerxes: both men destroy themselves through their own *hubris*.[98] M. L. West, however, points out that the *oratio recta* makes it unlikely that the reference to Phaëthon is part of the fragment, since Choerilus is unlikely to have had a character give the location of Phaëthon's death in direct speech.[99] Rather, the reference is likely a helpful addition on the part of the scholiast to provide further information as to the identity of the river Eridanus.[100] The scholiast, then, simply provides the information as to where Choerilus located the river without actually quoting him.

Bernabé proposes to emend the text of the scholiast from "Germania," which he sees as an anachronistic reference for any of the Choerili, to "Gerania," the city that was home to the Pygmies and from which they were driven by the cranes.[101] Choerilus of Samos would have had cause to mention this city, and the Geranomachia, in a digression during his description of the Scythian campaign of Darius.[102] The corruption could have arisen when the scholiast, unfamiliar with *Gerania*, altered the word to the more familiar *Germania* with the simple insertion of a μ.

---

[97] The epic poet: A. F. Naeke, "De Cherilo," *Index praelectionum hibernarum*, Bonn, 1838-1839 (=*Opuscula Philologica* I, ed. Fr. Th. Welcker, [Bonn: Impensis Ed. Weberi, 1842], 273-5). The tragedian: A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1889); B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen, 1971). Lloyd-Jones and Parsons assign the fragment (=*SH* 332) to the *dubia* of Choerilus of Samos, but note that it is not certain to which Choerilus the lines belong.

[98] Naeke 1842, 275.

[99] West 1981, 104-5.

[100] Colace summarizes the difficulty in determining the precise location of the Eridanus (1979, 92-4).

[101] Gerania, ubi Pygmaeorum gens fuisse proditur; Catizos barbari vocabant creduntque a guibus fugatos, "Gerania, where the Pygmies are said to live; the barbarians call them "Catizi" and think that they were put to flight by the cranes" (Pliny, *NH* 5.1.9).

Barigazzi and Bernabé cite the proem of Callimachus' *Aetia* as evidence for the inclusion of a reference to Cyrus and the cranes in the *Persica*. One difficulty with this is that Callimachus must then be inverting the order in which the events would likely have appeared in the *Persica*. Chronologically, the death of Cyrus (530) must precede the Scythian invasion of Darius (ca. 512) and presumably this would be the order in which Choerilus presented them. It is, of course, impossible to reconstruct the extent to which Choerilus would have treated these events; although he was indebted to Herodotus, he need not have slavishly followed the historian in degree as well as in kind. Reference to the fate of Cyrus might have been included only briefly to illustrate the rise to power of the Persian empire; Darius' ill-fated Scythian campaign may have been included to demonstrate a previous military disaster for the Persians who suffered a similar one in their campaign against the Greeks. Such digressions were common to Herodotus, whom Choerilus is held to have emulated, and to Homer, an author whom Choerilus can be expected to have emulated in his return to the epic genre. Callimachus' inversion of the natural order could reflect criticism of an author who narrated such diverse matters ancillary to his theme. Conversely, that a similar jumble of events is found in the

---

[102] "Quérilo...habría narrado en su poema la campaña de Ciro contra los Masagetas, extensamente historiada por Heródoto, así como el tema de la geranomaquia, este último con ocasión de la campaña de Darío contra los escitas, asimismo referida por el historiador de Halicarnaso, principal fuente de nuestro poeta épico," (Bernabé 1984, 322).

Augustan *recusationes* may suggest that Callimachus' inversion may in fact reflect Choerilus' order.[103]

Against Barigazzi's and Bernabé's ingenious and clever reading, we must set the objections of Cameron who contends that the thrust of Callimachus' diatribe on the correct form of poetry in the prologue of the *Aetia* is on size and not on content. Cameron argues that the contrast between good and bad poetry is not based on their differing subject matters but on their differing sizes, indicated through these images by "the *distance* [Cameron's emphasis] that cranes fly and Scythians shoot. These long distances are then contrasted with Callimachus' own short poem. They are just colourful ways of evoking length."[104]

Cameron's argument is, however, somewhat shortsighted, coloured by his underlying assumption that these lines cannot refer to anything other than length. It is hardly impossible for the erudite Callimachus to pack his words with several levels of meaning, so that the reference to the cranes and the Massagetes, while a comment on inappropriate length for poetry, can also contain an equal and apposite reference to inappropriate subject matter, narrated at length. It is not only the theme of the distance, indicated by the flight of cranes and arrows that links the two images, but also the shared purpose of their respective flights: the cranes fly the great distance from Thebes to Egypt, but only to wage war against the Pygmies (αἵματι Πυγμαίων ἡδομένη), while the arrows of the Massagetes fly far (μακρόν) when launched against a Persian man (ἐπ' ἄνδρα [Μῆδον), an image which clearly indicates warfare. The description of the distance cranes fly is balanced by an equal line describing the purpose of their flight; the only indication of distance in the image of the Massagetes, unless we assume that the arrows are being shot from Scythia to Persia, is the adverb μακρόν, which is again balanced with the reason for that flight. Warfare is a common epic theme, and the Persian Wars in particular had received ample poetic treatment to the time of Choerilus.[105] Callimachus, by selecting these specific images, can dismiss poetry not only on the grounds of excessive length, but also on the grounds of common or hackneyed subject matter. The equal emphasis given to the purpose of the flight, together with Callimachus' multi-layered imagery, suggests that Cameron errs in his assertion that the images of the cranes and the Massagetes must refer only to length. Instead, Callimachus selected the *Persica* as a poem to help illustrate his criticism of inferior poetic styles and common epic themes of war.

---

[103] For the Augustan *recusationes* see pages 158-159.

Callimachus does implicitly comment upon both great length and common subject matter in his *Aetia* and condemns both equally. Apollo enjoined Callimachus to keep his sheep fat and his poems slender (*Aetia* fr. 1.23-4) and also to shun common subjects in favour of ones that are fresh and novel (*Aetia* fr. 1.25-8). Callimachus puts into practice the instructions of Apollo in the prologue of the *Aetia*, in the context of his denunciation of other styles of poetry. His reference to the defects of the *Big Woman* (ἡ μεγάλη γυνή) are so abstruse as to be unintelligible,[106] and in this single allusion, which precedes his dismissal of the crane and the Massagetes, he packs criticism of both size and

---

[104] Cameron 1995, 354-5.

[105] Callimachus would presumably also have been aware of Timotheus' account of the Wars.

[106] There has been a lengthy debate over the identity of the *Big Woman* and its significance, with opinion being divided among Mimnermus' *Nanno*, his *Smyrneis*, and Antimachus' *Lyde*. For a concise summary see Allen 1993, 146-56. Allen favours Mimnermus' *Smyrneis*, a comparatively lengthy epic on the battle between the Smyrnaeans and Gyges and reads τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν, "of the two," as a reference to two distinct types of poetry found in the collection, the *Nanno*: the short, small-scale elegies, and the single long elegy known as the *Smyrneis* (1993, 23-6).

technique. The *Big Woman* is a lengthy, monotonous, epic-style poem, to be contrasted with the superior, lighter, and allusive styles.[107] The vivid images of the flight of the crane and the arrows of the Massagetes are not then mere references to excessive size conjured up by the image of distance. Instead, they can be read as references to some specific work, which, like the *Big Woman*, the better, sophisticated, and erudite class of audience could be expected to recognize, and which is condemned, like the *Big Woman*, on the grounds of both size and style.

That Callimachus is condemning both size and technique is further indicated by his disdainful reference to poetry composed by the yard (αὖθι δὲ τέχνῃ / κρίνετε,] μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην, "therefore, judge poetry by craft and not by the Persian *schoenus*," [*Aetia* 1.17-18]) which follows the image of the crane and the Massagetes.[108] The deliberate selection of the Persian *schoenus* as measure of length to condemn long continuous poems is especially appropriate if the poem in question is one on Persian matters.[109] The reference to the Persian *schoenus* and the Massagetes against whom the Persians, under Cyrus, fought in an author known for the skill with which he selects his words suggests that a particular poem on Persian matters is shaping Callimachus' denunciation of inferior poetic styles. A logical candidate is Choerilus' *Persica*.

The inclusion of references to the campaigns of Cyrus, then, is possible. Choerilus may have narrated them at length before turning to narrate those of Darius. It might, however, be more likely that mention of Cyrus was made in digressions in the context of

---

[107] Allen 1993, 155.

[108] The Persian *schoenus* was a unit of land-measure, the length of which was variously estimated from thirty to sixty stades (one stade = approx. 600 feet).

[109] For the interpretation of "one unbroken song," see n. 57 of this chapter.

Darius' activities. Cyrus himself had little immediate relevance to the Greeks, making a poetic account of his campaigns somewhat unlikely.

Although we cannot know if Cyrus' military campaigns were narrated, we can conclude, with some confidence, that those of Darius and Xerxes were. The evidence of Callimachus suggests that the various battles of the two invasions were narrated in turn, perhaps with ancillary material added. As well, the likelihood that Herodotus, who included much descriptive and digressive material in his Histories, influenced Choerilus supports this idea. As a genre, epic is well suited to such narrative, as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* attest. Choerilus, in harnessing contemporary history to the epic genre, freed himself from the constraints of linear narrative and from the need for a self-contained storyline.

CHOERILUS' APPROACH TO THE PERSIAN WARS

I will now examine Choerilus' approach to the Persian Wars. A very interesting fragment, and one that is informative as to Choerilus' approach to his topic, comes from the *Persica*'s proem:

> ἆ μάκαρ, ὅστις ἔην κεῖνον χρόνον ἴδρις ἀοιδῆς,
> Μουσάων θεράπων, ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών·
> νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι,
> ὕστατοι ὥστε δρόμου καταλειπόμεθ', οὐδ' ἔτι ἔστι
> πάντῃ παπταίνοντα νεοζυγὲς ἅρμα πελάσσαι
>
> Oh, blessed was he, whoever was a skilled singer, a servant of the Muses at that time when the meadow was still untouched; but now when all things have been distributed, and the arts have their limits, we are left behind last in the race, nor is there any place, peering all about, for us to draw up our newly-yoked chariot (*SH* 317).

The programmatic nature of its five lines hints at Choerilus' view of the poetic tradition that lay before him, his approach to writing the poem within this tradition, and his aim for the finished piece. In the fragment, Choerilus presents himself as a deliberately innovative poet who adopted a new approach to the writing of poetry. Judging by the initial reception of the poem, this approach proved successful, although the popularity of historical epic did diminish.

The fragment contains a Vesuvius-like eruption of metaphors designed to lament the current state of poetry. We move from what was once a pristine meadow, to one now marked off and divided up, and finally to the image of a chariot race in which it is impossible for modern poets (ὕστατοι) to find a place. Choerilus certainly describes an unenviable position for the modern poet who lives and must try to write at a time when the petrifaction of the poetic forms allows little scope for innovation and where there is little room for any more poets to compete. The latter complaint is implied in the image of the race in which earlier poets (implied by the contrast with ὕστατοι) have not only taken a lead on the field, but also have choked that field, leaving no opening for new and modern poets to enter the race.

The fragment has been read as a fairly aporetic statement. Choerilus, in the very process of writing his poem, admits that poetry of his kind has had its day: the poet metaphorically throws up his hands in despair, laments the current state of poetry, and confesses that the time for epic has passed.[110] On this reading, the poet would have informed his audience at the outset of his poem that what he was about to tell them was boring, hackneyed, and essentially a waste of their time to hear. Then, having guaranteed his failure with such a disclosure, he decided to ignore his own pronouncement and recite the poem anyway. By conservative estimates, the poem was at least two books long. Choerilus would then have spent a great deal of time reciting a poem which he had just told his audience was valueless and which they would not like.

---

[110] Lesky notes "while trying to harness Homeric techniques to the narration of history, Choerilus admits that poetry of this kind has had its day" (1966, 304-5). For similar sentiments, see Albrecht Dihle, *History of Greek Literature*, trans. Clare Krojzl (London: Routledge, 1994), 221, Eva Stehle, "Help me to Sing, Muse, of Plataea," *Arethusa* 29 (1996), 222, and Hollis 2000, 13.

This is not a very satisfying reading of the fragment. It is very odd behaviour for a poet to go out of his way to alienate his audience by declaring that his style of poetry has no value, and then to turn around and continue at great length in that very style. It is odder behaviour still for the audience not only to disregard the poet's own warning that his poem was worthless and remain to listen, but also to bestow fame and prestige upon the poet on the basis of that very poem. This reading not only flies in the face of what can be considered logical behaviour for any poet or audience, but also does not concur with the image of a poet made famous by that poem. It does not mesh with the fame of the poem which earned repeated public recitations, which paved the way for other epics on historical events, and which remained famous at least to the Augustan period. Certainly it does not mesh with the fact that the poet then continued with a lengthy composition in the very poetic style that he had just condemned. Clearly, a different interpretation of the programmatic fragment and of Choerilus' attitude to the writing of poetry is needed to correspond to the fame achieved by the *Persica*.

Unfortunately, we do not have the complete sentiment of Choerilus, much less the entire poem. The fragment gives us the set-up for the problem, but not the solution. We do however have the context for the piece that can help to fill out the picture. Aristotle preserves part of the third line as an example of an apologetic proem, used by an author who wishes to win indulgence (ὥστε συγγνώμην ἔχειν) from his audience when his subject matter is paradoxical or difficult or has already been treated by many (*Rhet.*

1415a).[111] The remaining lines of the fragment are supplied by a scholiast on the Aristotelian passage that also confirms the implicit apology. An apology is a defense and not an admission of error.[112] An apology in advance for what might be perceived as problematic does not preclude the offering of assurances that there is in fact a ready and acceptable solution. Although both Aristotle and the scholiast indicate the apologetic nature of the proem and Choerilus' lamentation regarding the current state of poetry, this cannot be the entire sentiment offered by Choerilus as a prelude to his *Persica.*

A different reading of this passage will help to explicate what Choerilus had in mind as he wrote the lost *Persica.* His lament on the current state of poetry must have preceded his answer to the problem of writing at the end of a long poetical tradition; the *Persica* itself would then have put this solution into practice. The conclusion reached by Choerilus was a return to an earlier form of poetry, that is to epic poetry, albeit epic poetry with a twist: Choerilus will use the traditional form but not the traditional subject matter. He will not write about the old mythological stories such as the return of Odysseus or the fall of Troy. Instead, he will take his subject matter from the recent past, namely the Persian Wars fought a generation before his time. In effect, he puts new wine into old wineskins.[113]

If Aristotle is correct that Choerilus apologized in advance to his audience, it must follow that he then offered them some assurance that the time spent listening to him would not be wasted. Choerilus' lament on the current position of poetry may have been a rhetorical device, common in oratory, in which the speaker professes to be unworthy of the task and calls attention to the formidable obstacles standing in the way of what he is required to do, thereby all the more astounding his audience when he does exactly what he claimed was too difficult. Although we cannot know the exact form that it took, or the imagery with which it was expressed, what followed the lament on the difficulty faced by current poets must have been either an explicit solution or implicit assurances that the solution would present itself through that very poem. This would fit the context as supplied by Aristotle and the scholiast who cites the fragment as an example of an apologetic proem. The poem in its entirety would then demonstrate the merits of this solution clearly and to the audience's satisfaction.

---

[111] We might compare the sensible response of Cato the elder to A. Postumius Albinus (cos. 151) who apologized in advance to his audience for what he was sure would be a disastrous attempt to speak Greek. Cato points out that it would be preferable to ensure that one avoids the mistake than to seek pardon for knowingly committing it (Aulus Gellius *NA* 11.8).

[112] ἀπολογία, "apology" is a technical term for a defense speech (*LSJ* s.v. ἀπολογία). Perhaps the most famous apology is that of Socrates at his trial in which, of course, he admits to no errors.

A line-by-line reading of the fragment, examining the images in sequence, will help to explicate Choerilus' intention, to see if we can supply the missing punch line and account for the successful reception of the poem. Literary analysis is a difficult thing even when dealing with complete texts or with authors who have substantial amounts of poetry extant; working with fragmentary authors is even more challenging. One must be mindful of Badian's warning treating supplements as guaranteed text and using them to prove arguments.[114] We are, however, fortunate that in the case of Choerilus, although we have only a small amount of his poetry, we do have a rich anecdotal tradition that can help to provide context for the surviving fragments. While accepting the judgments of the ancient critics at face value is not the soundest methodology, their repeated equation of Choerilus with the Persian Wars suggests that his fame derived from his *Persica*. This

---

[113] The proem can, in fact, be viewed as a *recusatio*, in which Choerilus declines the common poetic forms.

[114] Badian 1989, 51-70; and compare page 51.

equation in turn, together with the repeated public performances, suggests the success of his poem, which in turn implies that he has not condemned it.

The imagery of the proem begins by contrasting an earlier golden age with the current age of poetry. This contrast is heralded by the first words, ἆ μάκαρ. Μάκαρ, "blessed," is often used in reference to the gods, to indicate the vast gulf between their status and that of mortals; when used of mortals, it again highlights a difference in status, contrasting the blessed existence of the μάκαρες, "blessed ones" with the miserable lot of the regular mortal.[115] Choerilus immediately expands on this address, providing an identification of this fortunate soul: he is not just anyone who lived at that earlier time when the meadow was inviolate, but specifically a skilled singer (ἴδρις ἀοιδῆς) and a servant of the Muses (Μουσάων θεράπων), that is to say a poet.

Huxley suggests that Choerilus' implicit desire to be a Μουσάων θεράπων, a "servant of the Muses" refers specifically to Homer who, in the opinion of the ancient authors, stood at the beginning of the Greek poetic tradition and consequently had all heroic legend at his disposal.[116] While at first reading this does seem plausible, especially given Choerilus' adoption of the guise of an epic poet, this is too restrictive an interpretation. Not only does the phrase not appear in Homer (rather its first appearance is Hesiod, *Theog.* 99-100), it was a common description for poets working in any style and so cannot be used to refer specifically to Homer.[117] It is unlikely that Choerilus, by expressing a desire to be a Μουσάων θεράπων, is condemning all poets since Homer.

---

[115] C. de Heer concludes that μάκαρ was very rarely used of humans, having "a sense denoting a fundamental distinction between gods and men," and signifying an "easy life whose attainment was beyond human hope" (*ΜΑΚΑΡ–ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ–ΟΛΒΙΟΣ–ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ :A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the end of the Fifth Century* [Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1969], 5-6).

[116] Huxley 1969b, 16.

To suggest that nothing new had been done since epic would be to condemn the genres of lyric, elegy, tragedy, and comedy together with their best poets. In any case, the equation of the Μουσάων θεράπων with Homer does not fit with his comment that "now all things have been distributed" (νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται). To understand Choerilus' usage of the phrase, we can compare *Il.* 15.189, where the same verb phrase (πάντα δέδασται) indicates the distribution of honours and territory to Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades; similarly at *Il.* 1.125, the phrase indicates the distribution of prizes among the warriors. Choerilus' use of the phrase may signify the apportioning of appropriate subject matter to particular genres.

Choerilus' lament is not that there has been nothing good or new since Homer, but rather a two-fold lament that appropriate genres have been determined for particular subject matter and now that there are now so many poets it is difficult to do anything new: everything has already been done. Choerilus does not decide to return to the status of the epic poet because epic poetry is the only good style, but rather because he can break with tradition, redefine epic and make it into a new style. The contrast is then between the golden age of poetry and its current state.

The golden age is signified by the image of the meadow. The meadow is described as ἀκήρατος, which means "untouched" or "inviolate." The word signifies land that is sacred to the gods and forbidden for human use. There is a significant *comparandum* in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, where the meadow from which Hippolytus

---

[117] E.g., *Hymn. Hom.* 32.20, [Homer] *Margit.* 1.2, Archilochus fr. 1*IEG*^{2}, Theognis fr. 769 *IEG*^{2}, Eur. *El.* 717, Ar. *Birds* 909 and 913.

gathers a garland for Artemis is also ἀκήρατος.[118] The meadow is clearly off-limits to regular mortals, who are forbidden to pasture their livestock there or to cultivate it. Hippolytus, however, has a special dispensation to enter it and take from it a garland as a gift to the goddess. This privilege results from his own unique status as the beloved devotee of Artemis, as well as the intent with which he enters the meadow: he does this solely to procure a gift suitable to offer to the virgin goddess.[119] In the *Hippolytus*, as in the fragment of Choerilus, the sense of ἀκήρατος is land that is set aside for the use of the gods or those favoured by the gods.

The emphasis on poetry in the fragment of Choerilus suggests that the meadow is specifically sacred to the Muses. I suggest that this inviolate meadow is the source of poetic inspiration: inspiration which was a gift from the Muses and which was not free for the taking by the epic poet. This fits with the convention that the epic poet received his inspiration from the Muses, but did not enter their meadow to take it for himself. For the epic poet, poetry was a gift from the Muses, who stood in the position of teacher or mentor to their chosen poet.[120] Rather, only by being inspired by the Muse and channeling her voice could the poet know the truth and sing it beautifully.[121] The Muses also jealously guarded their province. As evidence, we can compare the myth of the Thracian poet Thamyris from whom the Muses took the ability to sing and play the lyre as punishment for his boasting of his skills against theirs (*Il.* 2.594-600).

---

[118] Euripides describes the meadow as ἀκηράτος (73), then defines this by prohibitions against the use of the meadow by mortals (75-6). Barrett collects several comparable examples from inscriptions of similar prohibitions against the use of sacred land, (1964, *ad loc.* 73-6). Aristophanes' *Frogs* 1298-300 provides a similar reference to poets and their desire for a pure meadow, contrasting Aeschylus and Phrynichus (see page 117).

[119] Only those who are themselves inviolate like the meadow may enter (76-81). For example, bees, by virtue of their own perceived chastity, are permitted. On the chastity of bees, compare Semonides' fr. 7.83-93 *IEG*^{2}; for a detailed examination of bees in the Greek world, see Malcolm Davies and Jeyaraney Kathirithamby, *Greek Insects* (London: Duckworth, 1986), 47-83, esp. 69-70 for the bee's distaste for sex. J.M. Bremer examines the erotic overtones of the meadow in the context of female beauty and sexuality and in particular, the violation of virginity ("The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*," *Mnem.* 28 [1975]: 268-80).

[120] On poetic inspiration in the later poets, and the varying contribution of poet (skill) and Muses (inspiration), see Penelope Murray, ed. *Plato on Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 6-12, and her "Poetic inspiration in early Greece," *JHS* 101 (1981): 87-100.

The conceit of the epic poet as the passive conduit for the song of the Muses is found throughout Homeric epic. It is announced in the opening lines of the *Iliad* (μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, "sing the wrath, goddess") and the *Odyssey* (ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, "sing to me the man, Muse"). The image is that of the Muse singing through her chosen poet; the song is not his own creation but rather the creation of the goddess that the poet merely delivers. A more explicit image of the poet as the mouthpiece for the all-knowing Muses, and of the contrast between poet and Muses, is found as a prelude to the Catalogue of Ships:

> Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχουσαι
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,
> ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν
> Now sing to me, Muses who have Olympian houses,
> for you are goddesses, you are everywhere, and you know all things,
> but we only hear the fame but do not know it (*Il.* 2.484-6).

Here too the poet contrasts himself with the Muses, without whose intervention he would be incapable of the task of knowing and singing. It is only through their gift that he is able to rise to the occasion of song.

In the third line of the fragment, the present (νῦν δέ) is contrasted with the earlier golden age. Choerilus frames his criticism of the present day in terms of the consequences for poetry (τέχναι). Contemporary poetry has suffered a decline that has coincided with the desacralization of the meadow. Since Choerilus began with the image of the fortunate poet who lived when the meadow was still sacrosanct (ὅτ' ἀκήρατος ἦν ἔτι λειμών), presumably Choerilus himself lived in a time when this was no longer the case. Since such a meadow is one which is forbidden to mortals, it would appear that the meadow of the Muses is now subject to repeated trespass; this trespass has resulted in poetry which is no longer the creation of the Muses to be shared with a fortunate few, but rather the product of regular mortals who compose at will using only their own, and presumably fallible, skills.

---

[121] Of course, as Hesiod tells us, the Muses can sing even lies beautifully and as though they were the truth

The desacralization of the meadow is inherent in the contrast between its earlier pristine state and its current state, primarily in the image of all things having been distributed (νῦν δ' ὅτε πάντα δέδασται). The force of the image of the meadow at the end of the second line is still prominent in the listener's mind at the beginning of the third line where we are told that all things have been circumscribed. The image seems to be of the once inviolate meadow now marked and apportioned out. Mortals, entering the meadow of the Muses, have appropriated it and left behind on it an indelible mark. The sense of all things having been distributed may have been the apportioning of subject matter to appropriate media or perhaps the fixing of the rules for the various forms. Or perhaps here we have the sentiment that in the latter half of the fifth century everything has been done, that myths have been told and re-told to such an extent that it is no longer possible to find anything new to say about them, or find any new way in which to treat them.

Although the exact way in which mortals have interfered in the meadow of the Muses is unclear, what is clear is another characteristic of this age of poetry, namely that

---

(*Theog*. 27-8).

the arts, among which we will find poetry, have reached perfection (ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι, "the arts have their limits"). Literally, the πείρατα are the limits of a thing and for an art to have its limits suggests that this art has reached its perfection.[122] We find support for the translation of ἔχουσι δὲ πείρατα τέχναι as "the arts reach their perfection" in a similar phrase attributed to Zeuxis, a painter and contemporary of Choerilus. Zeuxis, challenging his rival, Parrhasius', claim to supremacy in art, retorts Ἡράκλεια πατρίς, Ζεῦξις δ' ὄνομ'· εἰ δέ τις ἀνδρῶν / ἡμετέρης τέχνης πείρατά φησιν ἔχειν, / δείξας νικάτω, "my country is Heraclea, my name is Zeuxis; if anyone says that his art has reached perfection [lit., "he has the limits of our art"], let him show it and win" (*FGE* p. 104).[123] A victory is possible for the artist who can support the claim of having perfected the craft. The ἡμετέρης of the second line, spoken by the painter Zeuxis, would suggest that he uses τέχνης in the sense of painting rather than that of poetry as in the lines of Choerilus. What Choerilus laments is that with the perfection of poetry, no room is left for poets to be creative.

Choerilus indicates the consequences of the interference of mortals in the affairs of the Muses in lines four and five. The image in these final lines is that of a chariot race and the inability of contemporary poets to find a place in the pack. Not only is the modern poet left behind but he can find no place to bring up his own chariot, no matter how hard he might peer about. This is of course a metaphorical race, one which poets can enter continuously and at any time, with the goal likely simply being personal fame and success, rather than the defeat of all other competitors.

---

[122] B.K. Braswell makes this point in his detailed discussion of the phrase πείρατ' ἀέθλων in Pindar's fourth *Pythian*, which includes a discussion of the etymology of πεῖραρ and numerous citations to support his contention. He does, however, omit Choerilus' usage (*A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988], *ad* 220[b]).

[123] Zeuxis too was a member of the court of Archelaus; he painted the King's palace between 413-399. Given the similarity of the phrase, we can speculate that Choerilus and Zeuxis were at the court at the same time; this, however, cannot be proven.

One result of the appropriation of the Muses' field could be the explosion in the number of poets. In contrast to the earlier epic age where inspiration was a gift from the Muses and bestowed only on certain select individuals, the current age has seen the opening up of the Muses' field and the inspiration that is found there becoming more readily available to all. This would result in a far greater number of poets who could become poets not by divine inspiration but rather from their own initiative. Poets would no longer be the Muses' servants and poetry would no longer be the province of the elite, or even the skilled. The proliferation of poets would result in the crowded raceway into which modern poets, unable to find an opening, cannot get a chariot, which is to say a poem, in edgewise.

Poetry as a chariot is a common metaphor (e.g. Pindar *Ol.* 9.5, 9.81 and *Isth.* 2.2). Choerilus' newly-yoked chariot, for which he despairs of finding a place, is on one level simply temporal: his newly-yoked chariot is the song he is currently singing, in contrast to those songs written by the poets who have preceded him. On another level, his chariot is newly-yoked in the sense that it involves either new material or a new style, or a combination of both. Choerilus' novelty in yoking his chariot involves a return to an earlier and superior form of poetry, specifically epic. Choerilus however introduces a new twist to epic and will treat events not from the distant past but rather from the recent past.

Choerilus was not the first poet to introduce recent events into his poetry, and he was not the first poet to introduce events from the Persian Wars into poetry. Simonides preceded Choerilus in his narrative elegies, lyric poems, and epigrams; the tragedians

Phrynichus and Aeschylus both treated the Wars in dramatic form. Choerilus however was the first poet to treat the Persian Wars in the epic genre and may have gone beyond his predecessors in the scope of his work; he was also the first poet in several decades to write on the theme of the Persian Wars. While the earlier poets concentrated on individual aspects of the Wars, namely the individual battles of 480-479 and their immediate aftermath, it is likely that Choerilus narrated the history of the entire Wars, including the invasion of Darius.

We are fortunate in that in addition to the five lines of the proem, we also have what is very likely the first line and a half of the poem (*SH* 316). These lines herald a return to the status of epic singer as a channel for the Muse, a guise not often seen since Archilochus announced himself as a poet in a dramatic and emphatic first person narrative (fr. 1 *IEG*^{2}). Choerilus has revived, with some significant distinctions, the position of Homer as the passive conduit of song, aligning himself with the μακάρ whose status he has envied.[124]

Clearly what has been preserved of Choerilus' proem (*SH* 317) does not contain an invocation to the Muse. Nevertheless, the imperative ἥγεό μοι, "tell me" in an epic poem, strongly suggests such a supplication. The second line is not complete, and is missing two feet. It is possible that an invocation to the Muse, a common convention of epic poetry, was contained in the missing two feet, perhaps spilling over into the following lines if Choerilus wanted to include decorative epithets. It is also possible that we are missing one or more lines before the lines cited by Aristotle. Although Aristotle cited the *Persica* along with the known first lines of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, he was concerned primarily to provide examples of *exordia* that supply the theme of the piece for the listeners. The openings of the Homeric epics are not mirrored in the opening of the *Persica*. While the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* announce their themes in the first few words, the μῆνις, "wrath," and the ἀνήρ, "man," respectively, the *Persica* requires several more to perform this task. Aristotle cites a half-line for the Homeric poems but a line and a half for Choerilus' poem. He could certainly have omitted a detailed invocation to the Muse, an invocation implied by ἥγεό μοι, if it appeared in the preceding or subsequent lines that were not concerned with the theme, or if it were contained in the missing half-line. It is highly probable that the missing part, either preceding or following the lines quoted by Aristotle, contained the customary invocation. The opening lines of the *Persica* suggest then that the poem put into practice the plan formulated by Choerilus and promised in the proem.

---

[124] One significant distinction between the stance of Homer and that of Choerilus is that Choerilus will, at least in his proem, inject himself personally into the narrative. He adopts a somewhat self-conscious approach to his task, unlike his more famous predecessor.

Critics, attempting to account for Choerilus' image of the newly-yoked chariot, tend to assimilate him to the Callimachean model and propose that, like Callimachus, Choerilus advocated travel along a new path.[125] This is, however, a misreading of the fragment and its implications, coloured by the well-known Callimachean ideal (*Aetia* fr. 1.27-8).[126] Choerilus seeks to find for himself a place within the coveted ranks of poets and not outside of them. This is implied in the image of the chariot race (δρόμος): a contestant cannot win a race by stubbornly ignoring the official course and setting one of his own. By the homage paid to the servant of the Muses, Choerilus indicates a desire to align himself with the poets of the earlier age.

---

[125] E.g., Naeke, "Excusatione egebat, quod viam novam ingredi et ab aliorum poetarum usu recedere sibi proposuisset," "he offers excuses, because he proposes to travel a new path and to remove himself from the practice of other poets" (1817, 106); similarly, Barigazzi (1956, 168-71), and Huxley who reads Callimachus' admonition to his followers to "urge not your car along the flat open road...but follow the untrodden ways even if you drive along a narrower road" (*Aetia* fr. 1.27-8) as an implicit attack on the decision of Choerilus (1969b, 16).

[126] The earliest extant reference to the "new path" may be found in Pindar who, in an absolute declaration of innovation, rejects the well-worn path not only of the epic singer, but of all other poets as well (*Pa.* 7b.10-14 Snell-Maehler). Pindar rejects not only the content but also the style of epic, providing an account of the birth of Apollo that differs from that found in the homeric *Hymn to Apollo* just as the style of the *Paean* differs from the *Hymn*. Compare Ian Rutherford, "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo," *CQ* 38 (1988): 65-75;

His newly-yoked chariot is not the startling departure from the current poetic forms that would be necessary in a poet who wanted to abandon the contemporary ways. Instead, with his return to the epic genre, he harnesses new content to an old chariot. Epic had already provided expression for ancient history, in the forms of the Homeric and Cyclic epic. Even Choerilus' predecessors, Eumelus and Asius, while attempting to catalogue the history of their respective city-states, began with events of the far distant, mythic, past. What made Choerilus' creation new was his decision to introduce contemporary history into a genre previously reserved for ancient history.[127]

Choerilus signals his intent in the first line, with his request to the Muse that she sing another song (ἤγεό μοι λόγον ἄλλον). The story that follows is one not previously seen in epic. In the fragment of the proem, Choerilus describes an unenviable position for any poet to be in: he suggests that poetry has declined from its earlier state and has since become common, or at least has run out of new themes. Choerilus must, however, have offered a solution to this problem in the missing part of the proem. Having told his audience that it was not at all possible for a modern poet to bring up a newly-yoked chariot, he must then have offered his audience a solution that would have piqued their interest or at least prevented them from walking out. I suggest that his solution was

---

Peter Bing notes that Pindar will tell his own, new story—the birth of Asteria (*The Well Read Muse* [Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988], 104-5).

[127] The claim to originality in poetry is not itself original. E.R. Curtius provides a useful discussion of the *topos* in *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York: Pantheon, 1953), 85-6.

a return to the status of a poet as the Muses' servant, one who derives his inspiration from the goddess rather than taking it for himself. Such a poet could then appeal to the Muse for help in placing his chariot of song. He will become, as the epic poets of the past, the Muse's mouthpiece. Having done so, he edged his chariot into the crowded field of the race and thus he won the coveted crown of the poet, namely fame.

Despite Choerilus' claims for his poem and its immediate success, he was not entirely successful in refashioning epic into a vehicle for contemporary history. His poem did not achieve the lasting fame of the Homeric epics, with only one poet even attempting to follow Choerilus' lead: Rhianus' *Messeniaca* (*SH* 923; 946) narrates the events of the second Messenian War; it must be noted, however, that the Messenian Wars, the subject of Rhianus' epic, belonged more to the distant past rather than to the recent. It was not until the Roman period that historical epics flourished, with Ennius' *Annales* (Rome's history from the Trojan War to Rome's defeat of Aetolia ca. 189), Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* (the first war with Carthage), Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (the civil war between Caesar and Pompey), and Silius Italicus' *Punica* (the second war with Carthage). It is perhaps noteworthy that each of these poets chose the theme of war.

Although the Persian Wars had many of the features of the Trojan War, they could not be assimilated to the heroic world. The reason for this might lie in the fact that Choerilus' audience was too close, temporally and emotionally, to the events described to allow them to transfer the Persian Wars to that world. J.B. Hainsworth suggests that "[t]ime as well as faith is necessary to make men into heroes."[128] It is also possible that the new styles of poetry and music resulted in a diminishing interest in epic forms.

---

[128] J.B. Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 63.

Nevertheless, Choerilus' attempt and the Athenians' initial ranking of the poem with the poetry of Homer speak to the continued importance of the Persian Wars to the Greek mindset.

THE PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

It remains to consider the place of the first performance of the *Persica.* In an admittedly corrupt sentence, the *Suda* specifies that Choerilus received one gold stater per line for his poem, that it was voted to be recited along with the poems of Homer (σὺν τοῖς Ὁμήρου ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ἐψηφίσθη) and gives a title that indicates a decidedly Athenian slant (the *Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes*). The information that Choerilus received one gold stater per line is suspect: a similar story is told of the poet Choerilus of Iasus, suggesting that this information belongs to him rather than Choerilus of Samos.[129] Nevertheless, we cannot be certain how the mistake in the *Suda*'s entry originated. If it was a simple clerical error, with the compiler(s) mistakenly copying information from the entry for Choerilus of Iasus into that of Choerilus of Samos, then its evidence can be confidently rejected. If, however, the compiler(s) faithfully transcribed factually incorrect material that was thought to be true, the line does have evidentiary value for the perception of Choerilus' *Persica* and its place of performance. Although the information is most likely incorrect for Choerilus of Samos, its inclusion in the sentence may indicate that the compiler(s) of the *Suda* thought it belonged to him and that they included it to indicate the worth of the *Persica*: it merited one gold stater per line and was worthy of being recited along with the poems of Homer, the preeminent epic poet.

---

[129] For detailed reasons for suspecting and rejecting certain elements of the entry, see Appendix B.

The combination of title and vote suggests that the place of performance was an Athenian setting where the Homeric poems played a role. Since a public vote is generally not required for private matters, the statement that the poem was voted to be recited with the poems of Homer suggests an official, formal context. The anecdote further suggests that the poem had been performed at least once already and that its performance with the poems of Homer was in recognition of its excellence: officials are unlikely to vote to include an unheard, untried poem in a public setting together with the preeminent epic poet.

A suitable candidate for the re-performances of the *Persica* is the Great Panathenaea, the quadrennial festival in honour of Athens and its patron, its citizens, and its empire. Between 454-404, tribute was displayed at the festival, implicitly indicating Athens' might and the extent of its empire. This festival would provide an ideal place for the performance of a poem highlighting the bravery and the military prowess of Athens in the face of a substantial military threat. While it is plausible that the Athenians voted that the poem be recited once rather than made part of the formal Panathenaic programme in perpetuity, it is perhaps more likely that, given the *Suda*'s account which suggests a great worth put on the *Persica*, we can infer that the poem was recited at the Great Panathenaea more than once.

Against the theory that the *Persica* was recited at the Great Panathenaea, we must set a passage in Lycurgus who prosecutes Leocrates, for treason and religious impropriety, after he had deserted Athens following their defeat in the battle of

Chaeronaea (338).[130] In the course of his speech, Lycurgus mentions several poets who had composed patriotic verses and singles out the unique status Homer had in Athens: ὑπέλαβον ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες σπουδαῖον εἶναι ποιητήν, ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο καθ' ἑκάστην πεντετηρίδα τῶν Παναθηναίων μόνου τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ῥαψῳδεῖσθαι τὰ ἔπη, "your ancestors held that [Homer] was a poet of such worth that, every four years at the Panathenaea, his epics, alone of all poets, would be recited" (*In Leo.* 102). Clearly, Lycurgus believed that Homer alone was recited at the Panathenaea, leaving no room for the *Persica*'s recitation.

The orators are, however, somewhat ill-informed about the history of Athens. Their knowledge of their history was based not on written records but rather on an oral tradition.[131] That Lycurgus attributes the recitation of Homer at the Great Panathenaea to the Athenian ancestors (ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες) rather than to a certain and specific lawmaker reflects this imprecise understanding of Athenian history. Furthermore, that he cannot name the specific lawmaker responsible suggests that he is providing not an accurate quotation from Athenian law, but rather a paraphrase. It is possible that the Athenian ancestors did not exclude the recitation of any other poets at the Great Panathenaea, but rather made the inclusion of Homer mandatory. Lycurgus' emphasis on Homer might be a rhetorical flourish to illustrate his point about the supremacy of Homer and the martial and moral values he transmits, values that are integral to his prosecution of the deserter, Leocrates.

---

[130] That Lycurgus cites no relevant law prohibiting the actions of Leocrates and encourages the jurors to be lawmakers as well as jurors suggests that the actions of Leocrates were not technically criminal (Usher 1999, 325 and n.4).

[131] See Thomas 1989, 196-237 for the shaping of public memory and record.

Lycurgus continues to illustrate his point about the importance of martial courage and self-sacrifice with quotations from various poets, including Simonides' epigrams on the Persian Wars. Were the poems of Choerilus recited at the Great Panathenaea, or at least still prominent in the public mind, Lycurgus would likely have mentioned him here. Choerilus' absence from Lycurgus' list need only mean that by 330 Homer alone was being recited at the Great Panathenaea and that Choerilus had ceased to play a role at the festival at some point in the past sufficiently removed to be no longer in the mind of Lycurgus or his audience. Lycurgus' silence on Choerilus might also indicate that Choerilus' *Persica* did form part of the Panathenaic programme, but did so after the death of Lycurgus (ca. 325), or that the *Persica* was performed once, along with the poems of Homer, but never re-performed. Homer was part of the popular culture and school curriculum and so would be known to all. The other poets mentioned were either elegiac poets whose poetry had a place in public festivals or aristocratic symposia, or tragedians whose plays were performed at the City Dionysia. Like Homer, they would not be readily forgotten. Choerilus, having no place in either popular or aristocratic culture, could easily have passed from the minds of the Athenians.[132]

CONCLUSIONS

Choerilus' *Persica* was performed at Athens, between ca. 425 (when the *Histories* were well-known in Athens) and 395 (the death of Lysander, which whom Choerilus was associated resulting from the fame of his *Persica*). It continued the practice of narrating the Persian Wars through poetry and points to the continued popularity of accounts of the

---

[132] See also Naeke 1817, 89.

Wars at Athens. Choerilus is situated not only in the tradition of epic poems on historical events, but also within the larger tradition of poetic accounts of the Persian Wars. In his narration of the Persian Wars, Choerilus differed from his poetic predecessors in narrating not one discrete battle, but rather the invasion of Xerxes in its entirety, as well as the earlier campaigns of Darius against the Greek world; he may also have narrated Darius' earlier military campaigns.

Choerilus did share some traits with his predecessor, Aeschylus. Both poets put a Persian face on the battles, narrating events at the Persian court, and emphasizing the *hubris* of Xerxes. Choerilus also shared this interest in ethnographic detail with Herodotus. In Choerilus, we can see also the continuation of the presentation of the Persian as Other, a trait that continues with Timotheus' *Persians*.

It is possible that his predecessors still more directly affected Choerilus' approach to the Persian Wars. Choerilus' desire for a newly-yoked chariot may reflect not only the statement of a poet who desires a new poetic form, but also one who desires new poetic material. Unable to find both, Choerilus settled upon old wine in an older wineskin, and in the process developed a new poetic form: historical epic. While his style did not catch on, it nonetheless won fame for Choerilus. This points to the continuing importance of the Persian Wars to Athens.

CHAPTER 4: THE NEW MUSIC (TIMOTHEUS)

Timotheus of Miletus (ca. 445-355)[1] celebrated the Persian Wars in an equally unconventional fashion. Although Timotheus had no first-hand knowledge of the Wars, he was able to draw on the writings of his literary predecessors, as well as the popular tradition of the cultural significance of the Wars to the Greek world in general and to Athens in particular. Whereas Choerilus, seeking an "uncut meadow," refashioned epic to suit contemporary history, Timotheus was able to exploit a newly emergent musical style to provide some degree of novelty to his treatment of the theme. The mid-fifth century saw a musical and poetic revolution, conventionally known as the New Music, which abandoned many of the constraints of the older forms of music. This new musical style allowed Timotheus to create in his *Persians* (*PMG* 788-91) a remarkably vivid account of the battle of Salamis, which won for him lasting fame. Despite the New Music's freedoms in content and style, Timotheus' presentation of Salamis and the Persians was conventional; it built on earlier treatments and owes a particular debt to Aeschylus' *Persae*. In this chapter, I examine the *Persians* as an example of the New Music, discuss how the New Music affected Timotheus' presentation of this event, account for the widespread popularity of his *Persians*, and place Timotheus within the development of the tradition of the Persian Wars.

---

[1] The standard dates for Timotheus' lifespan are ca. 450-360. I have modified the dates his slightly to reflect the various anecdotes and traditions concerning his life (see n.142).

TIMOTHEUS' LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Timotheus is best known as a practitioner of the New Music. "New Music" is an umbrella term coined by modern scholars for what the ancient critics most often termed "theatre music" and is used to describe the musical revolution of the mid-fifth century.[2] The revolution in music encompassed diverse styles, in particular dithyramb, *nomos*, and drama, all of which were performed publicly before a large audience.[3] The use of the singular term to describe such diverse genres is justified by the style's shared characteristics and approach to composition. The New Music began simply enough, with a tendency towards increasingly complex and elaborate notes and rhythms. It culminated in a style that was astrophic and polymetric, both physically and musically mimetic, and that subordinated the text to the music. It is the growing importance of the music to the performance as a whole that defines the New Music.[4]

Timotheus' *Persians* is a citharoedic *nomos* in the style of the New Music and is by far the most extensive example of this poetic type extant.[5] The *Persians* stands near the end of the developments in the New Music and so can only be understood in light of these musical and poetic innovations. Before turning to examine the *Persians*, I will examine the history and characteristics of the New Music in order to determine its effects on Timotheus' presentation of the Persian Wars.

---

[2] Eric Csapo, "Later Euripidean Music," *ICS* 24-5 (1999-2000): 401. Csapo and I independently arrive at much the same conclusions regarding the history of the New Music and, in particular, Euripides' debt to Timotheus (see Csapo 405-15 and my pages 259-268).

[3] Csapo 1999-2000, 401.

[4] E. Csapo and W.J. Slater argue convincingly that the increased primacy of the music was a "symptom of the professionalization of the music industry" and suggest that the increased autonomy of musicians led to more specialized and innovative pipers who could display greater virtuosity (*The Contexts of Ancient Drama* [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994], 332-3). Cf. Csapo 1999-2000, 402-3.

[5] Although the poets used the term *nomos* to refer to any song, including bird song, as long as it had a recognizable melody, it also had the more technical and restrictive meaning, especially among the music critics, of the song sung by the citharodes that had recognizable features and melodies (West 1992, 215-7). Since the term *nomos* itself designated many types of song, each with its own rhythmic requirements, it was most often used with an epithet (e.g., citharoedic) to distinguish the exact type (E. Laroche, *Histoíre de la racine NEM- en grec áncien* [Paris: Librairie C. Klinchsieck, 1949], 169).

Eric Csapo has recently argued that the "mini-biographies" of individual poets that, together with an emphasis on their "individual creativity," form the bulk of studies of music are insufficient to establish the history of the New Music and its social and cultural significance. He complains, rightly, that such biographies ignore the social and economic factors that make such innovations possible and acceptable.[6] Nevertheless, the ancient critics' comments concerning the individual innovations of the poets can help us to determine the qualities and characteristics of the New Music.

Evidence for the development of the New Music comes from the comic poet, Pherecrates, and his play, the *Cheiron*.[7] The character of Music appears on-stage, laments to the character of Justice concerning her treatment at the hands of the new poets, and provides a catalogue of the abuse she has suffered (Pherecrates fr. 155 *PCG* [=[Plut.] *de musica* 30.1141c-1142a]).[8] Melanippides of Melos appears as the first offender (fl. 440-415; fr. 155.3-8). His innovations were adopted and expanded upon by the Athenian

---

[6] Csapo 1999-2000, 401-5. He promises to expand upon his study of the historical, social, and cultural effects of the New Music in two forthcoming articles ("The Politics of the New Music," in *Music and Culture in Ancient Greece*, eds. P. Murray and P. Wilson [Oxford] and "The Production and Performance of Greek Comedy in Antiquity," in *A Companion to the Study of Greek Comedy*, ed. G. Dobrov [Leiden]).

[7] Wilamowitz doubted Pherecrates' authorship of the play on several grounds. He points to the ancient critics' disagreement as to the author of the play, noting that Athenaeus attributes it to Nicomachus, and asserting that the play is the work of "ein salzloser Nachahmer"; furthermore, he states that the catalogue of musicians in the play is incorrect, and that, because of the closeness of Pherecrates' lifetime to that of the poets in question, this mistake could not have happened during Pherecrates' lifetime (1903a, 74-5 n.4). Nevertheless, Pherecrates' authorship has been upheld. I. Düring notes how the theme of the play, with its emphasis on musical and literary issues, conforms to a common current in late fifth-century comedies, such as Aristophanes' *Gerytades* (in which Old Music is brought back from the Underworld) and *Frogs* (in which the ghosts of Euripides and Aeschylus compete for the privilege of returning), while the order is explained by Greek biographical tendencies (I. Düring, "Studies in Musical Terminology in 5th Century Literature," *Eranos* 43 [1945]: 177).

[8] In the *Cheiron*, the main theme was a contest between Old and New Music. It is unfortunate that we do not have New Music's rebuttal of the charges of the Old Music. Such a rebuttal, whether pro-New-Music or anti, would flesh out our perceptions of popular opinion of the New Music.

Cinesias (ca. 425-390; fr. 155.9-13), the Mytilenean Phrynis (fl. ca. 446; fr. 155.14-18) and Timotheus (fr. 155.19-28) who was the worst of the lot.[9] The chronological order of the four poets is slightly askew, with Phrynis intervening between Cinesias and Timotheus, who were contemporaries. Nonetheless, the order is explainable with reference to the Greek tendency to order people according to a master/pupil relationship: although Phrynis is older than Cinesias by a slight margin, Cinesias was known to be a pupil of Melanippides and so follows him; Phrynis precedes his pupil Timotheus who, as the most famous of the poets of the New Music, comes last.[10] Although Pherecrates is a comic poet and not a music critic, his account could be expected to reflect the popular or traditional history of the perceived degeneration of Music; the evidence from Pherecrates is supported by references to these same poets in other critics ([Plutarch] and [Aristotle]) and in Aristophanes. I will examine the innovations of the poets to determine both the state of Music when Timotheus began and the expressive potential of the New Music.

Melanippides introduced astrophic song in place of the responsion of strophic or triadic verse (ἀντὶ τῶν ἀντιστρόφων ἀναβολάς [Arist. *Rhet*. 3.9.1409b]; see also Arist. [*Pr*]. 19.15). The term *anabola* is in reference to something composed in place of strophes. A strophe is a "musical unity," with a repeating complex metrical and melodic sequence; strophes can repeat immediately or, in triadic structure, after an intervening *epode* with its own distinct rhythmical structure.[11] *Anabola*, in contrast to strophes, signifies a looser metrical structure in which a poet could switch between modes and metres, and start afresh at will with a new intonation rather than conform to the metre required by responsion.[12] Freed from the requirements of strophic responsion, the poet could then shape the melody to exploit the emotional nuances of the text; this can result in a highly expressive performance.[13]

---

[9] Music ends her indictment of the first three poets with a variation upon "him, I could stand"; her condemnation of Timotheus is unreserved.

[10] Düring 1945, 179-80.

Another of Melanippides' innovations of which Music complains is his introduction of twelve strings to the lyre; she also complains of the use to which he put them (λαβὼν ἀνῆκέ με / χαλαρωτέραν τ' ἐποίησε χορδαῖς δώδεκα, "seizing me, he conquered me and made me looser with his twelve strings" [fr. 155.4-5].[14] Astrophic composition, with its freedom from fixed metres naturally lent itself to polymetry. The greater the number of strings, the greater the range of notes available with which to mimic the emotional tone of the poetic text. Without accepting the number twelve as factual, we can nevertheless interpret the claim of Music to suggest a greater number and variety of notes, allowing for high-pitched notes to indicate wailing, sharp or shrill notes to indicate anger, and so forth.[15]

Astrophic and polymetric composition are characteristics of the New Music. Pherecrates alludes to Phrynis' astrophic ~~song~~ with references to his bends and turns and his modulations (fr. 155.18). A similar allusion is found in Aristophanes' *Clouds* where the Better Argument discusses the good old days where dire punishment awaited anyone who attempted τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν ταύτας τοὺς δυσκολοκάμπτους, "those hard-to-

---

[11] M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 5.

[12] Düring 1945, 183; West 1992, 357 and 1982, 5 and 138 n.2.

[13] West 1992, 136 and 358.

[14] Csapo and Slater note "the passage from Pherecrates puns continuously on terms that have both a musical and sexual meaning" (1994, 336).

[15] West, examining both visual and literary evidence, concludes that in the seventh century, the lyre had seven strings and that starting in the fifth century "certain provocative citharodes" began to add extra strings. The names of those responsible for each successive string vary depending on the source and it is impossible to determine the truth of the matter (West 1992, 62-4).

bend bends in the style of Phrynis" (970). Phrynis' innovations must have been common knowledge by 423, when *Clouds* was first performed, if Aristophanes' allusions were meant to be meaningful to his audience.

E.K. Borthwick detects a reference to Cinesias' astrophic poetry in Pherecrates' *Cheiron*: ἐν ταῖς ἀσπίσιν / ἀριστέρ' αὐτοῦ φαίνεται τὰ δεξιά, "[in his dithyrambs] right appears as left, as in shields" (fr. 155.11-12).[16] He understands this as an allusion to "the revolution of the chorus being no longer now right, now left as in strophic compositions" and understands it to refer to the abandonment of responsion in favour of *anabolae*.[17] Aristophanes parodies the music of Cinesias in *Birds* 1372-409, including a reference to Cinesias' *anabolae* (1384-5) and a parody of his polymetric song (1393-400). Aristophanes' parody indicates that Cinesias was using these characteristics at least as early as 414, when *Birds* was first produced.

The New Music also allowed movement from mode to mode within a single piece. "Mode" is the common translation of the Greek term *harmonia*, which itself refers to a distinctive octave sequence; moving from mode to mode would then suggest changing the relationship between the intervals of the octave within a piece. In addition, rather than an exact correspondence between note and syllable, a syllable could be stretched over several musical notes. Extramodal flourishes and purely musical interludes were also permitted.

The New Music rejected the responsion between metrically identical stanzas that had characterized the earlier lyric styles in favour of free stanzas that could mingle together a variety of metres, without any discernible order. This was a significant innovation in that it allowed the poetic text to be composed without regard for the number or quality or pattern of syllables. There was no requirement to balance short syllables with long ones in a mandated order, either within one line, or over the course of several. This enabled the poetic text to be much freer. Words could be chosen exclusively for their contribution to the beauty or pathos or to the atmosphere of the piece rather than chosen to conform to a set metrical pattern. We will see in the case of Timotheus' *Persians* how this could be used to great effect.

---

[16] Düring sees a play on words in these lines, noting that ἐπ' ἀριστερά means 'unskilfully' and 'awkward' while δεξιάς means 'clever' so that "that which in the opinion of Cinesias was meant to appear δεξιά, clever, impressive, comes to nothing and seems ridiculous" (1945, 186).

The New Music was both physically and musically mimetic, in that both the performer and the music could imitate the action described in the text. Aristotle comments, unfavourably, on the physically mimetic aspect of the New Music, singling out bad pipe-players who twirl themselves around to mimic (μιμεῖσθαι) throwing the discus and who grab at the chorus-leader when performing the *Scylla* (*Poet.* 26.1461b; [=*PMG* 793]). Aristotle's criticism can be understood as a reference to Scylla's snatching of sailors from passing ships, action that is mimicked by the pipe-player as he performs her story. From this, we can conclude that the New Music permitted a physically mimetic element.

The musically mimetic aspect of the New Music is alluded to by the reaction of the audience upon hearing Timotheus' *Birthpangs of Semele* (*PMG* 792). The title of the piece suggests that Semele's labour was the central feature of the poem. Since Semele gave birth to Dionysus only after being blasted by the appearance of Zeus in his divine glory, complete with blazing thunderbolt, we can assume that her labour was more

---

[17] E.K. Borthwick, "Notes on the Plutarch De Musica and the Cheiron of Pherecrates," *Hermes* 96 (1968):

difficult than most. The delivery of the dithyramb occasioned some disbelief among its listeners, with one listener commenting on the screams of the performer, remarking that the screams would have been even more unbearable had Semele given birth to a labourer rather than a god.[18] Since another anecdote records that the piper who played the musical accompaniment to the *Birthpangs of Semele* walked around the stage with bulging cheeks, a bulging robe, and a heavy step (Dio Chrys. 78) we can assume a rather exuberant musical wailing on the part of the singer, complemented by the screeching of the pipes; there was also the potential for miming pregnancy and childbirth. We can also conclude that the conventions that governed the content of songs composed in the older styles did not apply to the New Music.

The New Music's freedom in terms of metre, music, and content allowed Timotheus to create a piece in which exciting, dramatic, and evocative descriptions could be delivered in a highly visual and aural manner, thus allowing the audience not only to hear but also to see the Greeks and, most likely, the Athenians, defeat the Persians.[19] Timotheus' presentation, while thoroughly modern in style, was nonetheless remarkably faithful to the content of Aeschylus' *Persae*.[20] This suggests that, despite the freedoms of the New Music, the image of the battle of Salamis was firmly entrenched in the minds of the Athenians and was not easily altered.

66.

[18] ἐπακούσας δὲ τῆς Ὠδῖνος τῆς Τιμοθέου, εἰ δ' ἐργολάβον, ἔφη, (sc. ὁ Στρατόνικος) ἔτικτεν καὶ μὴ θεόν, ποίας ἂν ἠφίει φωνάς, "hearing Timotheus' *Birthpangs*, [Stratonicus] said 'what screams would she have let loose, had she given birth to a labourer and not a god" (Athen. *Deip*. 8.352 [=*PMG* 792]). The specification "labourer," indicates one of the lower classes of mortals; presumably had Semele given birth to a mortal, and a labourer at that, the noise would have been even more horrific.

[19] For the leading role of the Athenians, see pages 252-257.

[20] For Timotheus' presentation of Salamis and the Persians as conventional, see pages 240-250.

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE *PERSIANS*

It is unfortunate that we do not have the complete text of the *Persians*. Nevertheless, we do have approximately 240 continuous lines, which were discovered in 1902 preserved on a damaged papyrus roll (=*PMG* 791).[21] The fragment uses a series of dramatic vignettes to narrate a naval battle in which Greek forces defeat those of the Persians. Although there are no proper names in the extant fragments that relate to the Persian Wars in general or to Salamis in particular, the battle is nonetheless easily identifiable as the battle of Salamis. The references to the yoking of the Hellespont (72-4; 114-6) indicate that the battle belongs to the context of Xerxes' invasion. The strong geographical and historical similarities to the battle of Salamis in the papyrus text, such as the presence of a reef (86-7) and a watching King (173-95) and the slaughter of Persians on a neighbouring island (140-4), allow for a more precise identification.[22] In addition to the papyrus text, three lines from the preceding section, including the first line of the poem, are preserved elsewhere (*PMG* 788-90); three other fragments that might belong to the *Persians* are also extant (*PMG* 800, *PMG* 1027f, and the recently published line in Philodemus, *On Poems* 1.89 [= 804a Hordern]).

---

[21] The *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* discovered the papyrus (*PBerol.* 9875 [=*PMG* 791]) in a sarcophagus in Abusir, Egypt. The regularity of the script and the uniform layout of the lines suggest the text was the product of a professional scribe (Peter van Minnen, "The Performance and Readership of the *Persai* of Timotheus," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 43 [1997]: 248). The archaeological context dates the papyrus to ca. 350 BC and so to the lifetime of Timotheus. We can, therefore, be reasonably confident that the text, our sole copy of the final 240 lines of the *Persians*, has not been significantly corrupted through extensive copying. We cannot, however, assume that the text has not been corrupted at all.

[22] For the yoking of the Hellespont, see Hdt. 7.34-6, Aesch. *Persae* 126-31, and Plut. *Vit. Them.* 16; for the presence of the King at Salamis, see Hdt. 8.90.4, Aesch. *Persae* 465-71, and Plut. *Vit. Them.* 13.1; for the slaughter of soldiers, see Hdt. 8.95 and Aesch. *Persae* 447-64; and for the damage caused the fleet by the nearby reefs, see Aesch. *Persae* 420-1. A reference to the yoking of the Hellespont has been found in Choerilus' *Persica* (*SH* 319), but this is better understood as a reference to Darius' yoking of the Danube rather than that of Xerxes (see pages 164-171).

Because of trauma inflicted on the papyrus roll prior to and during its interment, an indeterminate part of the poem has been lost between its opening line and the beginning of the fragment. The top section of the interred papyrus roll, unprotected by any form of cover, disintegrated almost completely after burial; this virtually destroyed the first column but left the final five columns largely intact. Wilamowitz was able to reconstruct several individual words from the remnants of the very fragmentary first column, extrapolate from the average size of the remaining columns and the number of papyrus fragments found in the sarcophagus, and conclude that no more than one column from the interred papyrus, or approximately sixty lines, was destroyed after burial.[23] He also noted a small edge with an unmistakable margin on the left side of fr. 1 and concluded that the interred portion had been severed from a larger roll prior to burial.[24]

Although Wilamowitz was able to determine with reasonable accuracy the amount of text destroyed after burial, it is impossible to know how much of the poem was cut away prior to burial, much less when this was done or for what reason.[25] Wilamowitz did speculate that the deceased's heir cut the text in order to keep the missing part and this conjecture has found much favour.[26] His second suggestion, namely that they simply did not have the missing portion at the time of burial, is more plausible. There is simply no evidence to support the idea that the missing portion was kept for selfish or sentimental reasons and much evidence to discredit it. The purpose of grave offerings was to provide the deceased with objects that were familiar, such as the tools that were found in the grave, or necessary, such as the coins, presumably for the payment of Charon. The provision of grave goods also gave the family one last opportunity to demonstrate publicly the honour and love in which it held the deceased; it could also serve to impress society with the level of the family's wealth and devotion.[27] After having settled the deceased with his tools and a (perhaps favourite) text, to deprive him of any part of that text seems churlish.

---

[23] With painstaking care the excavators recovered over fifty tiny fragments broken from the interred roll, with most containing no more than one partial character. Wilamowitz prints a diplomatic text for the (relatively) more substantial remains of the lost first column (1903a, 10-13). We can applaud his diligence as he attempted to reconstitute the text, and sympathize with his frustration: "Aber die erste Columne, die keine weitere Hülle hatte, war ganz zerrissen, und die einzelnen Fetzchen, die mit dem Sande sorgfältig aufgesammelt sind, enthalten oft nur einen Buchstaben, so dass die Zusammenordnung ausgeschlossen ist. Diese kleinsten Krümel berüsichtige ich nicht" (1903a, 2-3).

[24] A visual inspection of the fragments, including the "schmalen leeren Rand mit einer unverkennbaren Schnittfläche," is made possible by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's facsimile (*Der Timotheos-Papyrus: Lichtdruck-Ausgabe* [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'che, 1903b]). A reprint of both the facsimile and the *editio princeps* are conveniently bound together as Wilamowitz, ed., *Timotheos Milesus, Die Perser* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1974).

[25] Despite the mathematical speculations of Samuel E. Bassett, who confidently stated "four hundred verses were lost," it is impossible to determine how much of the poem is missing between the first line of the poem and the first intact line of the papyrus text ("The Place and Date of the First Performance of the *Persians* of Timotheus," *CP* 26 [1931]: 157 n.2).

Nevertheless, Bassett built on Wilamowitz' suggestion that part of the text had been deliberately kept and drew a sharp distinction between the relative importance of the included and missing sections. He argues that the fact that all quotations extant prior to the discovery of the papyrus come from the part of the poem not interred with the corpse constitutes "prima facie evidence of the importance of the lost portion."[28] Bassett's theory, however, is based on very little evidence. There are only three conclusively identified fragments extant from this missing part, each consisting of only one line; three other tentatively identified fragments, one of four lines and the others of one line, are also extant. Of the guaranteed fragments, only one line was widely cited, and that was the proverb "Αρης τύραννος· χρυσὸν Ἕλλας οὐ δέδοικε, "Ares is Lord; Greece does not fear gold" (*PMG* 790).[29] Both Plutarch and Pausanias preserve the first line (*PMG* 788) but do so in a context that would permit the substitution of no other fragment.[30] Plutarch also preserves a third fragment, σέβεσθ' αἰδῶ συνεργὸν ἀρετᾶς δοριμάχου, "respect Shame, the helper of spear-fighting Excellence" (*PMG* 789), which he cites as a moral maxim (*de aud. poet.* II. i 65; *de fort. Rom.* II. ii 2.66).[31] The battle narrative that dominates the interred portion, written largely from the point of view of the defeated and lamenting Persians, is devoid of any Greek thought or speech and so does not readily lend itself to similar sentiments.

---

[26] Wilamowitz 1903a, 3-4. For those who accept Wilamowitz' suggestion, see n.28.

[27] On the social function of grave goods, see Ian Morris, *Death Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 103-27.

[28] Bassett 1931, 154; 157 n.2. In this, he is followed by Janssen (1989, 12), and van Minnen (1997, 257). Neither Bassett nor Janssen state why the content of that section alone was deemed important enough to warrant being kept. van Minnen builds an elaborate, if groundless, theory as to the appeal of the poem to the Hellanomemphites: they could apply the missing portion to themselves in their own struggle to retain their "Greekness," especially in the face of the Persian threat to Memphis; they therefore kept the "earlier and more important part of the poem, which spoke so eloquently of the heroism of the Greeks of old...almost as if to demonstrate that they were not yet willing to part with their Greek heritage altogether" (257). Seemingly then, it was not the actual battle with and defeat of the Persians that mattered to those trying to retain their heroic Greek heritage, but rather the preliminaries to that victory.

Of the dubious fragments the fifth-century AD Macrobius preserves a four-line fragment that he attributes to Timotheus, albeit without a title (*Sat.* 1.17.19 [=*PMG* 800]). The quotation comes from a paean sung with a martial tone and so, on the strength of Aeschylus' mention of a paean the Athenians sing prior to the attack at Salamis (*Persae* 388-93), J.M. Edmonds claimed the fragment for the *Persians*.[32] Macrobius quotes it for the practical reason that it contributes to his discussion of the sun. If it is in fact from the *Persians*, there is no other mention of the sun in the extant portion that Macrobius could have rejected in favour of this quotation from the "more important" part. Dionysius of Halicarnassus cites the line οἱ δ᾽ ἐπείγοντο πλωταῖς ἀπήναισι χαλκεμβόλοις, "and they hurried on, with their bronze-beaked sailing chariots" (*PMG* 1027f [=790a Hordern]) as an example of a sequence of five cretics, but without supplying the author or title. Hermann Usener notes that the diction, with its highly coloured and elaborate metaphor and the profusion of descriptive adjectives, is strongly reminiscent of Timotheus and that the sentiment expressed is suitable to the context of a naval battle; he therefore assigns the fragment to the *Persians.*[33] This line, if in fact from the *Persians*, need not have come from the part removed prior to burial. The quotation most readily belongs to the battle narrative and so could easily come from the interred but disintegrated portion of the papyrus rather than from the "more important" missing section.[34]

---

[29] Zenobius, who preserves only the first part of the line, indicates its popularity (E. Miller, *Mélanges de Litérature Grecque* [Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965], 363). In his edition of the *Persians*, Janssen, strangely, omits the fragments transmitted separately.

[30] For the context of *PMG* 788, see pages 228-233.

[31] *Aidos* signifies "shame" as in the feeling of self-respect which discourages one from wanting to appear badly in front of others.

Although all of the securely-identified fragments extant prior to the discovery of the papyrus did come from the missing section, the paucity of these fragments (at most, only three lines extant from what Bassett estimates to be at minimum a missing 250 lines), the limited number of authors in which they appear, and the clearly identifiable and practical reasons for their quotation, do not support Bassett's contention that the

---

[32] J.M. Edmonds (*Lyra Graeca*, vol. 3 [London: William Heinemann, 1927], 306-7). Page (1962) David Campbell (*Greek Lyric*, vol. 5 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993]) and Hordern (2002) include the fragment with the unidentified poems.

[33] Hermann Usener and L. Radermacher, *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1956), vi. Wilamowitz (1903a), Edmonds (1927), Ernest Diehl, (*Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1925]) and Hordern (2002) agree. Campbell (1993) and Page (*PMG*) reserve judgment, noting the opinion of Usener but printing the fragment with the anonymous authors.

[34] In the extant portion, Timotheus proceeds in a linear fashion from the end of the battle through the fates of various Persians, to the retreat of Xerxes and the celebration of the Greeks, so that, logically, before the battle can be won it must be fought. On average, each vignette covers 35 lines. Wilamowitz estimated a loss of sixty lines, which would provide room for the account of the attack of the Greek forces. The decipherable initial fragments (e.g., λινοιοδ[[*PMG* 791.i.8.6], συν[εμ]βολο[ι]σι [*PMG* 791.ii.2] and λογχο[[*PMG* 791.ii.3]) indicate the battle has been joined.

opening part was considered the most important. Furthermore, as Timotheus moves briskly from scene to scene, it is difficult to imagine which image might have been the readily discernible and clearly demarcated boundary between the sections of differing significance which would then enable the heir to recognize the distinction and cut away only the important section leaving the less important section as a grave offering. At most we can note that an indeterminate part of no special significance is lost.[35]

We are, however, fortunate that we have a substantial portion of the main narrative of the *Persians*, as well as important fragments illustrative of the poem's scope and content. The *Persians* is the longest extant sample of the New Music; this offers us a welcome opportunity to consider the nature of the New Music. The *Persians*, lacunose as it is, thus provides us with a lengthy and late poetic treatment of the Persian Wars and, in particular, the battle of Salamis. It can, therefore, help us to flesh out our understanding of poetic treatments of the Persian Wars and is indicative of the continuing importance of the theme of the Persian Wars.

THE SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE *PERSIANS*

Although we do not have the entire text, we are able to determine the scope of the poem. From the preserved first line and its context, we can conclude that, like Aeschylus, Timotheus did not narrate the story of the Persian Wars as a whole. Instead, he focused on the Athenian naval contribution. While the extant portion is dominated by the battle of

---

[35] If the poem did have some special and lasting significance to the Greek community in Egypt, as van Minnen argues (1997, 257), surely a more logical solution to their desire to keep any part of the poem would have been to make a copy of the entire poem rather than to deprive the deceased of any part of his grave offering.

Salamis, we cannot necessarily conclude that the earlier naval battle at Artemisium was omitted.

Both Plutarch (*Vit. Phil.* 11.2-3) and Pausanias (8.50.3) preserve the opening line of the *Persians* (*PMG* 788) and guarantee its context: Philopoemen, fresh from his victory at Mantinea,[36] arrived at the Nemean Games during the citharoedic competition just as the singer began the *Persians* (Plutarch ἐνάρξασθαι; Pausanias καταρξαμένου) with the line κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον, "fashioning for Greece the great and glorious adornment of freedom" (*PMG* 788). The audience, upon hearing the first line and seeing Philopoemen, immediately turned to the general and applauded him, signifying that they were applying the song to him. Plutarch also supplies the motive for the audience's ovation: the audience did so because they associated Philopoemen and his deeds with the glorious deeds of their ancestors, seeing their victory at Mantinea as evidence that they were regaining their former prestige. The audience's motive provides the significance of the line and the poem, as well as the battle of Mantinea, to the Nemean audience.

The grammatical subject of the sentence is not expressed, although it is readily inferred from the context. The singular form of the participle, τεύχων, "fashioning," suggests a singular noun such as ἀγών, "battle" (*vel sim.*), or an individual.[37] Since the papyrus fragment narrates the battle of Salamis, ἀγών as the subject does sound plausible. Nevertheless, certain considerations argue against this. A noun such as ἀγών is perhaps too impersonal a subject to be applied to Philopoemen, as is indicated by the context. Plutarch implies that the audience was sufficiently familiar with the poem to recognize it from its very first line and made the instantaneous decision to apply the sentiment of that line to the one person they saw before them. The juxtaposition of Philopoemen's entry and the audience's actions suggests that the subject of the line would be someone to whom Philopoemen could be likened. This suggests that the subject was an individual rather than an abstract noun. Hordern suggested δῆμος 'Αθαναίων, "Athens" as the subject of the first line.[38] I think, however, that this too can be rejected since such a subject would require Philopoemen to be compared to a city-state.

---

[36] In 207, Philopoemen and the Achaean Confederacy defeated the Spartans at Mantinea and killed the Spartan king, Machanidas. This battle ensured the safety of the Achaean borders, sufficiently weakened the Spartans to allow the Achaeans to regain some of their lost territory, and gave Achaea, albeit temporarily, unquestioned primacy in the Peloponnesus (see Plut. *Vit. Phil.* 10; Paus. 8.50.1-2; and Polyb. 11.11-18).

[37] T. Reinach, "Les Perses de Timothée," *REG* 16 (1903): 66 n.1. Reinach also suggested, although without explaining his reasoning, that if a specific individual were necessary as subject, Lysander was a possibility (1903, 66 n1). We can, however, reject this suggestion since Lysander made no real contribution to the battle of Salamis.

Ares, Zeus Liberator, and Apollo have all been suggested as the subject of the line but can all be rejected with confidence.[39] The name of Ares is found elsewhere in the poem (*PMG* 790), but the god receives no thank-offering at the close of the battle narrative, as do Zeus and Apollo. This argues against sole credit for the victory being his. Zeus and Apollo are possible since the narrative of the battle does end with the Greeks erecting a sanctuary to Zeus and singing a hymn to Apollo (*PMG* 791.196-9). Nevertheless, these lines contain a marked balance between equal offerings made to the two gods; this balance argues against either god being singled out at the start of the poem as the sole architect of the victory. Although we cannot know how the opening lines developed the theme, it seems reasonable to assume that were Ares credited with "fashioning" the victory, he would not have been omitted from the scene of thanksgiving that closes the battle narrative. Additionally, the context of the fragment does not support any god as the subject of the sentence since the Nemean audience is unlikely to have applied the actions of a god so decisively to any mortal. Finally it is unlikely, and unprecedented, that a poem composed for an Athenian audience would assign sole credit for their greatest victory, one which had lasting psychological and cultural significance to Athens, to anyone, even a god, rather than to an Athenian.[40] While the Athenians were willing to render due credit to the gods for their help in the victory, they would not have so diminished their accomplishment at Salamis by ignoring their own role.[41]

---

[38] Hordern 2002, 128.

[39] In addition to his suggestion of "battle," Reinach suggested Ares, perhaps as metonymy for battle since Ares has little cult or literary presence as a god in the Greek world (1903, 66 n.1). Maurice Croiset suggested Zeus and Apollo ("Observations sur *Les Perses* de Timothée de Milet," *REG* 16 [1903]: 328). Croiset here rejects his earlier assertion, made prior to the discovery of the papyrus text, that the subject was Themistocles stating "la glorification d'un homme, et surtout d'un Athénien, est inconciliable avec la tendance générale du poème" (*Histoire de la literature grecque* III^2 [1899], 650). Croiset, however, misses the pro-Athenian sentiment of the poem (see pages 252-257).

Instead, a plausible subject of the sentence was the individual who did deserve to be, and who was, credited with the success of the battle of Salamis, namely Themistocles, the mastermind behind it.[42] It was Themistocles who built up the navy that won at Salamis, who correctly interpreted the oracle regarding safety and the "wooden walls" and, most importantly, who brought about the battle on his own terms by tricking both the enemy and allies alike.[43] Without the ingenuity and foresight of Themistocles, the Greeks might easily have lost both the battle and the War.

---

[40] For Athens as the place of first performance, see pages 251-257.

[41] We can compare Pindar fr. 77 (Snell-Maehler), where the poet assigns credit for the victory at the battle of Artemisium to the παῖδες ’Αθηναιών, the "sons of the Athenians."

[42] Croiset 1899, 650 (later rejected in favour of the gods); J. Sitzler (cited, without specific reference, by Hordern 2002, 128).

[43] For the navy, see Hdt. 7.144 and Plut. *Vit. Them.* 4; for the oracle, Hdt. 7.141-3 and Plut. *Vit. Them.* 10.3-4; for the forced battle, see Hdt. 8.74-6, Aesch. *Persae* 353-73, Plut. *Vit. Them.* 12, Diod. 11.17.1, and Nepos *Them.* 4.3-5. Additionally, Lysias calls Themistocles' contribution to the Wars πλεῖστα δὲ καὶ κάλλιστα, the "fullest and fairest" (2.42).

Hordern rejects the possibility that the subject is Themistocles, arguing that with the exception of Xerxes, "there are no individual characters in the extant part."[44] There are, however, other Persian individuals in the extant portion (e.g., the "drowning Persian" and the Persian suppliant). Furthermore, the presence of direct speech in *PMG* 789 and 790 imply a speaker, specifically a Greek speaker. This suggests that there were individual characters in the missing portion as well; if *PMG* 800—a *paean* to Apollo—can be securely assigned to the *Persians*, the likelihood of the presence of Greek individuals in the missing portion of the poem increases. Themistocles himself may have appeared in the missing portion as the speaker of *PMG* 789 and 790. He is said to have delivered an encouraging speech to the sailors prior to the battle (Hdt. 8.83) in which the exhortation to "respect Honour" and "Greece does not fear gold" would fit. We cannot, therefore rule out the possibility of an individual as the subject of the first line on the grounds that there are no individuals in the *Persians*; that Themistocles may have spoken in the missing section increases the possibility of him as the subject of the first line.

Philopoemen was a worthy parallel to Themistocles because his own contribution to the battle of Mantinea mirrored that of Themistocles to Salamis; as well, the battle of Mantinea was as strategically and psychologically significant as Salamis. Both men brought about a similar political result through their military strategy and planning. Prior to the battle, Philopoemen equipped the Achaean soldiers with new weapons, defensive armour and tactics, and trained them to fight with the new equipment alongside the newly-recruited mercenary forces; he may also have financed the new army from his own public and private earnings.[45] The Achaean success at the battle of Mantinea validated both the innovations in equipment and strategy and the foresight of Philopoemen just as Salamis conclusively demonstrated the importance of the strong navy advocated by Themistocles. Just as Salamis ensured freedom from Persian domination, so too did Mantinea make freedom from Spartan domination conceivable.[46] The rout of the Spartans, an immediate tactical benefit to Achaean sovereignty, was a psychological boost for the Achaeans who could, by virtue of their defeat of their most serious enemy, look with renewed hope for Achaean independence from Sparta.[47]

---

[44] Hordern 2002, 128.

Pausanias draws an implicit parallel between Philopoemen and Themistocles, appending to his account of Philopoemen's reception at Nemea the note that a similar thing happened to Themistocles at Olympia (8.50.3; see also Plut. *Vit. Them.* 17.4).[48] Philopoemen also appears, along with Themistocles, in a catalogue of the saviours of Greece (8.52.1-5), namely those men instrumental in checking Persian, and later Spartan, domination.[49] Chronologically, the catalogue begins with Miltiades, the hero of Marathon, and ends with Philopoemen, the hero of Mantinea, with a pointed comment that following the death of Philopoemen, Greece lacked good men (8.52.1). If Pausanias' interpretation reflects a valid understanding of the events of the earlier centuries, we can understand why Philopoemen would be a fitting parallel to Themistocles and worthy of the ovation at Nemea sparked by the first line of the *Persians*.[50] It is therefore possible that Themistocles is the subject.

---

[45] For the innovations in battle, see Plut. *Vit. Phil.* 9.1-3 and 7-8, and Paus. 8.50.1. R.M. Errington discusses the evidence for Philopoemen's financial contributions to the army (*Philopoemen* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1969], 64.)

[46] For a similar use of the battles of Marathon and Salamis as propaganda to motivate the Athenians to shake off the Macedonian yoke, see Demosthenes 19.312.

[47] Errington 1969, 70-8. Cf. the reaction of the crowd at Nemea to the juxtaposition of Philopoemen's appearance and the mention of the μέγας κόσμος ἐλευθερίας, the "great adornment of freedom."

[48] The order of events in Plutarch is chronologically impossible: the Olympian games occurred prior to the victory at Salamis. The story is likely apocryphal, illustrating the popularity of Themistocles (J.L. Marr, ed., *Plutarch: Themistocles* [Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998], 115).

[49] Interestingly, Plutarch denies the status of benefactor of Greece to Aristeides and Pausanias, the commanders of the Plataean campaign, because of their subsequent crimes.

If Themistocles is the subject of the first line, we can be certain that the poem narrates, at most, the Athenian naval victories; it is possible that the topic is restricted to Salamis. The battle narrative ends with the victory at Salamis, which suggests that Timotheus excluded the later battles of Plataea and Mycale (he may, however, have alluded to them in the missing portion). The sentiment expressed in the first line does not suit the disaster of Thermopylae.[51] Although Marathon is certainly worthy of the sentiment, no one person could be credited with both victories as required by the singular participle, τεύχων, "fashioning," in the opening line.

Support for the inclusion of Artemisium may be found in Athenaeus. A guest relates an anecdote in which a listener, upon hearing Timotheus' description of a storm, remarked that he had seen "a bigger storm in a pot" (*Deip*. 8.338a [=*PMG* 785]);[52] the guest, relying on memory, cites as his source for the anecdote the *Memoirs* of Hegesander who identifies the poem as the *Nautilus*. There is no mention of *Nautilus* in the *Suda's* catalogue of titles, although the *Suda* does mention *Nauplius* as an alternate title for the

---

[50] The anecdote about Philopoemen's reception at Nemea need not be factually true to illustrate the scope of the poem. That such a story is possible does that. The heroic honours accorded Philopoemen at Megalopolis are further evidence of his popularity (W. Dittenberger, *SLG*^{3} 624). See Diod. 29.21 for the sacrifices and *encomia* to Philopoemen.

[51] Despite its disastrous outcome for the Panhellenic alliance, the combatants at Thermopylae were not neglected. Accounts of Thermopylae focus on the valour of the dead and the glory the combatants won for Sparta rather than the battle's contribution to the war (Hdt. 7.207-33; Sim. *PMG* 531); see pages 78-91. Herodotus also alludes to the contribution the three-day battle made to the war effort in his account of Xerxes' attempt to conceal from the Persians the heavy Persian casualties (approx. 20 000) at Thermopylae (8.24-5). We need not, of course, accept Herodotus' figures at face-value.

[52] The guest's unfavourable comment is best read as sarcasm at an excessive description of a storm in the poem rather than a comment on an unsuitably small storm.

Persians.[53] Since the title *Nauplius* would most readily signify a poem about Palamedes' father, an unlikely topic for a poem considering the dearth of myth associated with him, it is possible that the *Suda*'s entry is corrupt. Unfortunately, the suitability of *Nautilus* as an alternate title for *Persians* requires some degree of stretching and creative explanation: the term "nautilus," either a poetic alternative for "sailor" or an adjective meaning "naval," might signify "Sea-poem" *vel sim.*, since a naval battle does dominate the *Persians*.

Since π and τι are easily confusable, a simple emendation would be to change the *Suda's Nauplius*, signifying a poem about Palamedes' father and an unlikely alternative title for the *Persians*, to *Nautilus*, mentioned by Athenaeus as the home of a storm. If so, the *Persians* might then have included the description of a storm. A logical candidate would then be the storm at Artemisium which, credited to Boreas, the Athenians' son-in-law, significantly reduced the Persian fleet and, consequently, the forces the Athenians would have to face at Salamis. The popularity of Boreas and his relationship to the Athenians at Athens make inclusion of his role at Artemisium, in a poem celebrating the Athenian naval victories in the Persian Wars and performed at Athens, likely. Nevertheless, this is based on very insecure evidence.

A new fragment of Timotheus has recently been published that may also support the inclusion of Artemisium in the *Persians*: <σεμ>νὸν δ' ὁ πλάτανος σ[εμ]νόν, "the plane-tree is a holy thing, a holy thing" (Philodemus, *On Poems* 1.89.6-8 [=fr. 804a

---

[53] The text of the *Suda* reads Πέρσας ἤ Ναύπλιον, "*Persians* or *Nauplius*" (*PMG* 785). In his apparatus, Page notes that Bernhardy proposed to delete the connective, making the terms two separate titles. Bernhardy is very likely correct.

Hordern]).[54] A.H. Griffiths claims the fragment for the *Persians*, suggesting that it comes from "a lost scene early in [the *Persians*], where Xerxes did reverence to a noble plane-tree near Callatebus on his way to the Hellespont (Hdt. 7.31)."[55] This suggestion has some merit: Xerxes' crossing of the Hellespont was a popular motif in accounts of the Persian Wars and the *Persians* did refer to his actions there (82-3, 124-7). A scene of Xerxes crossing the Hellespont, or the prelude to it, would necessitate at least the inclusion of Artemisium, since Timotheus is unlikely to have skipped from Xerxes' arrival in Greece to his defeat at Salamis without mentioning the intervening Athenian victory at Artemisium.[56] Timotheus, performing for an Athenian audience, could have composed a poem narrating the Athenian navy's contribution to the victory, namely Artemisium and Salamis. Themistocles, the mastermind and architect of the Athenian navy, could then be credited with both Artemisium (viewed not as a complete victory, but rather as one that paved the way for the later victory) and Salamis.

Nevertheless, the Herodotean parallel advanced by Griffiths does not support this theory. Timotheus presents a picture of Xerxes and his plane-tree that is neither attested nor implied by the scene in Herodotus. This suggests that Timotheus is not echoing the historian. According to Herodotus, Xerxes gave gifts to the tree κάλλεος εἵνεκα,

---

[54] Richard Janko, ed. *Philodemus, On Poems, Book 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). I follow Janko in taking σεμνόν as a predicate adjective, the neuter form being used to refer to a general truth (Smyth 1966, §1048). *Contra* Hordern, who, because of the differing genders of σεμνόν and πλάτανος, takes σεμνόν as referring to an element lost from the fragment.

[55] Griffiths is quoted in Janko 2000, 290 n.2.

[56] Although Artemisium was a tactical draw because of the heavy damage inflicted on both sides, it was nonetheless a strategic victory for the Greeks in that it maintained the Greek goal of survival while hindering the Persian goal of conquest. Athens' pride in Artemisium can be inferred from Pindar's reference to Artemisium as the place ὅθι παῖδες 'Αθαναίων ἐβάλοντο φαεννάν κρηπῖδ' ἐλευθερίας, "where the sons of the Athenians laid the shining foundation of freedom" (fr. 77 [Snell-Maehler]). For discussion of the fragment, see pages 39-41.

"because of its beauty" (7.31). The tree is not holy (σεμνός) or worshipped as such but simply pretty (καλός) and is rewarded for its beauty, not its holiness.

Therefore, to conclude that Artemisium was narrated as well as Salamis requires us to base our theory on an emendation, which is supported only by the unlikelihood of a poem about Palamedes' father as an alternate title for the *Persians*, the even less likely emendation "Nautilus" as an alternative title, the appropriateness of storms to Artemisium, and a fragment that is claimed for the *Persians* based only on a very insecure parallel in Herodotus or in Photius. Until better evidence surfaces, we cannot conclude that the *Persians* included Artemisium.

There is another possibility that might account for the reference to the plane-tree, if the new fragment does in fact come from the *Persians*, and that is that it comes from the preliminaries to the battle of Salamis. Photius, the ninth-century Byzantine scholar, summarizes the *New History* of Ptolemy Chennos (fl. ca. A.D. 100), who records that Xerxes sat under a golden plane-tree to watch the battle of Salamis (*Bibl.* 148b3 Henry).[57] Janko dismisses Ptolemy Chennos as "unreliable" and there are certainly ample grounds for this.[58]

The *New History* is lost. It is epitomized by Photius, whose reliability we are better able to ascertain. Photius had access to a sizable library, read extensively, made notes in the form of epitomes and excerpts, later dictated his notes to a secretary, and often relied on memory in order to compile his *Bibliotheca* (intended to collect descriptions of virtually all the books Photius had read).[59] There is, of course, plenty of room for error with such methodology.[60]

---

[57] "Salamis" is not named, but the phrase βλέποντα τὴν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων ναυμαχίαν καὶ τὴν 'Αρτεμισίας ἀνδρίαν, "watching the seabattle between the Greeks and Barbarians and the manliness of Artemisia" suggests that site; compare Hdt. 8.88.

[58] Janko 2000, 290 n.2.

Certainly, the anecdote as recorded by Photius is rather unbelievable. According to Photius' account of the *New History*, Xerxes sat under the golden plane-tree (ὑπὸ τῇ χρυσῇ πλατάνῳ), together with a sharp-eyed lad named Draco who was paid 1000 talents to watch the battle and report on the proceedings. There are several grounds for distrusting the anecdote: the fee is excessive and likely derives, as does the detail that the plane-tree is "golden," from the conventional image of the Persians as extremely wealthy; Draco is credited with the ability to see easily a distance of twenty stades; while the derivation of the noun ὁ δράκων from δέρκομαι, "to see clearly," makes the sharp-eyed lad's name suspect. Nevertheless it is possible that by the first century BC, the story of Xerxes' witnessing the battle of Salamis had grown and that explanations were sought to explain how Xerxes saw what he saw; this gave rise to the story of Draco that was recorded in Ptolemy Chennos and excerpted by Photius. We cannot, however, be sure, and cannot, therefore, confidently assign the new fragment to the *Persians* or to the preliminaries to the battle of Salamis. We do better to follow Hordern's lead and assign the fragment to the *incerti loci*.

Despite the fragmentary preservation of the *Persians*, we are able to determine the scope of the poem. Timotheus focused on the Athenian naval contribution and seems to have excluded the Athenian land victory at Mycale. Salamis dominates the extant portion of the text and is presented as the decisive victory over Xerxes. It is not, however, impossible that Xerxes' march to the Greek mainland and his defeat at Artemisium were also included, or that Timotheus alluded to Mycale in the lost portion; unfortunately, this cannot be conclusively proven or disproved.

---

[59] Warren T. Treadgold, *Nature of the "Bibliotheca" of Photius* (Washington, Dumbarton Oaks, 1980), 4; 111-4.

[60] Treadgold devotes one chapter to the errors and omissions in the *Bibliotheca* (1980, 67-80).

ANALYSIS OF THE *PERSIANS*

The *Persians* contains a plethora of outlandish expressions as it narrates, in vivid colour, the noise and chaos of a massive sea battle. The extant portion opens with a scene of utter confusion both literally, owing to the fragmentary preservation of the first part of the papyrus, and figuratively as we join the naval battle already in progress. Ships crash together and capsize while javelins and fire-arrows hurl through the air, striking ships and sailors alike. Screaming and shouting fills the air as the emerald-haired sea turns red with naval blood (σμαραγδοχαίτας δὲ πόν/τος ἄλοκα ναΐοις ἐφοι/νίσσετο σταλά[γμασι [*PMG* 791. 31-3]) and the Persian fleet is driven back in defeat not simply upon the sea, but rather upon the "fish-crowned sparkling-folded bosom of Amphitrite" (ἰχ]θυ[ο]/στέφεσι μαρμαροπ[τύχ]ο[ι]ς / κόλποισιν [’Αμφιτρίτ]ας [*PMG* 791.37-9]).[61] The sea and neighbouring shore are covered with corpses, while those few survivors lament and call upon the gods for salvation (*PMG* 791.94-103).

The fate of the retreating fleet wonderfully expresses the confusion, horror, and chaos inherent in the final scene of the naval battle as the Greeks decisively defeat the Persians (*PMG* 791.83-96). The Persians' attempt to retreat to safety is thwarted as they run aground on the nearby shoals; their ships shatter about them, they cast from their hands the "ship's mountain feet," and from their own mouths fly their shattered teeth (στόματος / δ' ἐξήλλοντο μαρμαροφεγγ/εῖς παῖδες συγκρουόμενοι [*PMG* 791.91-3]).[62]

Reinach identifies the στόματος μαρμαροφεγγεῖς παῖδες, "the brightly shining children of the mouth" as the teeth of the sailors. This has not met with universal approval, perhaps with some justification. It is a bizarre, and indeed grotesque, kenning. Janssen, dismissing the image of the fate of the sailor's teeth as "ridiculous," argues that the "shining children" refers to the ship's ram that is broken from the ship's prow (which is the mouth of the ship).[63] The "feet" of the ship suggest that the ship is personified; this personification could then extend to allowing the ship to have "teeth." Janssen argues that the ship's painted face renders the ship's prow as the mouth. The ships were equipped with iron rams on their prows that could be described as μαρμαροφεγγεῖς.[64] Janssen cites ἐμβόλαις χαλκοστόμοις, "bronzed-mouthed" (Aesch. *Persae* 415) as a parallel for the image of the ram in the context of the mouth of the ship.

Janssen, however, is mistaken. While a ship's ram can be referred to as ἔμβολος, or beak, this indicates something that sticks out from the prow of the ship; it is not parallel to the image of "teeth" contained within a mouth and hence able to "jump out" (ἐξήλλοντο) from that enclosure. The Aeschylean element, χαλκοστόμοις, rather refers to something that is mouth-like in its ability to bite, such as the point of a missile,

---

[61] The mention of the sea's dress, κόλποισιν, implies that the sea is personified as female; Amphitrite, the wife of Poseidon, fits both the metre and the sense and so is a likely restoration.

[62] Reinach 1903, 71: "les dents sautent des gencives"; accepted by Edmonds (1927, 317 n.3), Page (*PMG* 791), Campbell (1993,101 n.14), and Hordern (2002, 178). If we must look for the origin of such a metaphor, presumably, teeth could be said to be "children of the mouth" in that they generate or are "born" in the mouth after birth. We can compare Ion fr. eleg. 26.6, where grapes are referred to as "children of the vine" (cited by Hordern 2002, 178).

[63] Janssen 1989, 74.

[64] Iron, of course, can hardly be characterized as "gleaming." Poets, however, regularly referred to the iron rams as bronze rams, evoking Homeric usage.

rather than to the prow as the "mouth" of the ship.[65] Were it possible to refer to the ram of the ship as a "tooth," each ship still has only one ram, while Timotheus clearly refers to the many teeth (παῖδες) that jump forth from one mouth (στόματος). Finally, that the teeth do not belong to the ship but rather to the sailors is suggested by the syntax. The sailors' hands from which they cast the oars are parallel to their mouths from which fly their teeth. Despite the somewhat grotesque imagery, the smashing of human teeth must be what Timotheus intended.

The picture Timotheus paints becomes more impressive when one considers the mimetic nature of the music; not only would Timotheus describe the scenes, but he could also mimic the sound on his cithara. Furthermore, he could both increase the effect with the varied metres permitted the New Music, mimicking the sounds of the crashing ships and howling winds with the ornamental musical interludes. The *Persians* is comprised of a series of discrete vignettes, as Timotheus moves from scene to scene. It is likely that these vignettes were separated by one of the purely musical passages of which the critics complained. The mimetic nature of the New Music and the greater role of the music thus allowed Timotheus to present an enhanced aural performance in which he could complement the verbal descriptions of the naval battle with suitable musical effects.

Despite the artistic freedoms and the somewhat bizarre imagery, the description of the battle itself is rather conventional and conforms largely to the battle of Salamis as described by earlier authors. In particular, Timotheus follows closely Aeschylus' messenger speeches (*Persae* 353-466; 447-71).[66] The scene opens with the battle (*PMG* 791.1-39; *Persae* 386-426), followed by the slaughter on the island (*PMG* 791.109-73; *Persae* 447-64), and the reaction of Xerxes to his defeat (*PMG* 791.184-209; *Persae* 465-71). *PMG* 789 and 790 preserve direct speech, spoken by a Greek, and may echo the encouraging words of the individual sailors prior to the battle (*Persae* 380-1). If *PMG* 800, in which the speaker calls upon Apollo in a martial context, forms part of the *Persians*, then Timotheus may have also followed Aeschylus in recording the paean that opened the battle (*Persae* 387-91; 393). In addition to mirroring Aeschylus in structure, Timotheus mirrors him in detail as both poets create a vivid battle scene with ships crashing together, the sea filling with corpses, and the disorderly retreat of the Persians, all to the accompaniment of Persian screams. The close parallels between Timotheus and Aeschylus suggest that by the time of Timotheus' *Persians*, Aeschylus' *Persae* was both well-known and the standard image of Salamis.[67]

---

[65] Broadhead 1960, on lines 412-6, citing *Il.* 15.389 where the element is used of the point of a missile; for a similar use, see Sophocles, *Ajax* 651 and Euripides, *Supplices* 1206.

Janssen holds a different opinion, stating that Timotheus "does not give—and does not intend to give—a historically accurate description" of Salamis; instead, he prefers to see in Timotheus' description a generic sea-battle.[68] In support, he states that crashing ships and drowning men are common to all naval battles and cites military manoeuvres and weapons that are mentioned by Timotheus but not by Aeschylus. In the opening scene, Janssen sees a *diekplous*, a naval manoeuvre in which ships pulled through a gap made in the battle line of the enemy, "that had certainly not been executed in the battle of Salamis."[69] The *diekplous*, however, was very likely performed at Salamis and would therefore be at home in descriptions of the battle of Salamis.[70] The Ionian navy at the battle of Lade first performed it in 494 (Hdt. 6.12); the Athenians would therefore have been aware of it and likely able to execute it.[71] Furthermore, it was physically possible to perform the manoeuvre in the constricted waters of Salamis. Themistocles' ruse caused the Persians to split their forces, dispatching some to block off the entrances to the bay lest the Greeks escape (*Persae* 366-8; Hdt. 8.76). By reducing the number of Persian ships present at Salamis, the Greeks increased the room that they had to manoeuvre. The Greeks, in control of the battlefield and able to fight the battle on their terms, could have executed the *diekplous*, although perhaps not *en masse*. In the extant portion, Timotheus does not state that the *diekplous* was performed; instead, the opening scene simply indicates ramming, which most certainly was performed. Finally, Aeschylus hints at its presence at Salamis (*Persae* 398-402; 408-19).[72] We cannot, therefore, conclude on this basis that Timotheus is describing a typical sea-battle rather than the battle of Salamis. What can be seen to strengthen Janssen's theory are the likely references to the use of fire arrows (*PMG* 791.26) and lead weights (*PMG* 791.16-17).[73] The use of both devices is thought to date to the latter half of the fifth century, and so could not have been used at the earlier battle of Salamis. Despite the anachronistic elements, the battle's descriptions contain enough markers to instantly identify itself to the audience as the battle of Salamis.

---

[66] For a detailed comparison between Aeschylus and Timotheus, see Ebeling 1925, 319-23, and Hordern 2002, 175-80.

[67] E.D. Francis suggests that, throughout his description of the battle of Salamis, Timotheus is able to avoid proper names because they were so well-known following the success of the *Persae* ("Greeks and Persians: the Art of Hazard and Triumph," in *Ancient Persia: the Art of an Empire*, ed. Denise Schmandt-Besserat [Malibu: Undena, 1980], 79 n.145). I am grateful to Margaret C. Miller for bringing this article to my attention and for providing me with a copy.

[68] Janssen 1989, 23; see also Hordern 1999, 437.

---

[69] Janssen 1989, 24 and 30.

[70] I am grateful to my colleague, Kathryn Simonsen (University of Alberta), for discussion of this topic.

[71] At Artemisium, the Athenians were able to execute sophisticated navel tactics (Hdt. 8.11 and 8.16).

[72] Morrison, Coates, and Rankov see the manoeuvres described by Aeschylus as "a classic *diekplous*" (2000, 60).

[73] Hordern 2002, 143; 147.

What is interesting in a poem about the Athenian triumph over the Persians at Salamis, which battle the Athenians began to create as the one which ensured Greek freedom from foreign domination, is that no one is explicitly killed, at least not in the extant portion.[74] Instead, Timotheus offers the terrified reaction of the Persians to their imminent deaths and the destruction of their fleet and hopes. Timotheus moves from group scenes to individual ones and puts a personal face on the defeated Persians, yet one that conforms to the stereotype of the Persians as cowardly, wealthy, effeminate Barbarians.

Following a section describing the battle, Timotheus moves to a series of vignettes dramatizing the fates of several Persians. The section opens with a description of one shipwrecked Persian who remains defiant in the face of his certain death by drowning. The inability to swim was a common characteristic attributed to non-Greek, and so barbarian, cultures. Greeks could swim; barbarians could not.[75] In his picture of the drowning Persian, Timotheus further highlights the barbaric nature of the Persians. We are told that the drowning Persian chokes on water unmixed with wine (ἀβακχίωτος ὄμ/βρος [*PMG* 791.62-3]). This is not simply an empty circumlocution to indicate the sea-water in which the Persian drowns.[76] Instead it is an image designed to highlight the barbarian, and indeed monstrous, nature of the Persians.

---

[74] Compare the *Persae* in which Aeschylus suppresses Greek casualties and emphasizes the great number of Persian dead, resulting in the destruction of Persia (see page 133). In order to create the battle of Salamis as the decisive victory, the Athenians must omit the continued presence of Mardonius and the Persian army in mainland Greece.

[75] Hall 1994, 44-80.

ὄμβρος can be used to refer specifically to sea-water but also of water in general. Its juxtaposition with ἀβακχίωτος suggests the latter here.[77] Wine (generally mixed with water) was the drink of civilized men and the focal point of the symposium, the drinking party of aristocratic Greek men. Symposia were communal affairs, as indicated by the derivation τὸ συμποσίον from σύν, "together" and ποτίζω, "to drink." Their communal nature is further indicated by the role of the president (ὁ συμποσίαρχος) whose job, in addition to ensuring the proper mixture of water to wine, was to ensure an equitable distribution of wine to all guests; the *komos*, the revel which followed the symposium, publicly demonstrated group cohesion as the partygoers paraded through the streets.[78] In an inversion of sympotic imagery, the drowning Persian, separated from his companions, drinks water unmixed with wine, as he awaits certain death.[79]

Furthermore, the Persian who drinks water without wine is reminiscent of typical Greek monsters to whom wine is unknown. The conflict between humans and Centaurs resulted from the Centaurs' first exposure to wine: offered wine at a Greek wedding, the Centaurs run riot, descend into violence, and violate *xenia* in their attacks on the bride and guests. Similarly, the monstrous Cyclopes live without wine and many of the other trappings of civilization.[80] Of course, the Persian in Timotheus drowns, and drinks his "unwined water" neither by custom nor by choice. Nevertheless, Timotheus is able to use sympotic imagery to indicate the non-Greek nature of the vanquished Persian.

---

[76] Page glosses the phrase as "vini dissimilus (quia salsus, male potabilis), "unlike wine (because it is salty, undrinkable"). Compare Janssen who translates it "neat (sea)water" (1989, 52-3) and Hordern 2002, 160. For a similar circumlocution, see *PMG* 780 in which Timotheus describes wine as "the blood of Bacchus mixed with the tears of Nymphs."

[77] *LSJ* s.v. ὄμβρος.

[78] Oswyn Murray, *OCD*^{3} s.v. "symposium."

[79] For the use of sympotic imagery in Choerilus, see pages 175-183.

The drowning Persian berates the sea that is about to kill him and threatens it with retaliation from Xerxes, who had once before yoked, and so, theoretically, defeated, the sea (*PMG* 791.72-8). His trust in Xerxes and the vengeance the King will seek on those, including the sea, who caused the destruction of his fleet, is in vain as the Athenian audience well knows. This misplaced trust is made more poignant when Xerxes, watching the destruction of his ships and his men, packs up and retreats from Salamis, abandoning his dying men. Xerxes will try to save his gold but not his men. Despite the Persian's threats, the audience well knows that it is the sea that will take its revenge, killing one of those who once yoked it.

In contrast to the defiance of the drowning Persian who is threatened by the sea, those Persians threatened by the Greeks are more obsequious, contenting themselves with lamentation and pleas for mercy. One, a cowardly Phrygian, stands out from the mass of Persians; his character is indicative of Timotheus' presentation of the Persians as barbarians. In the Phrygian, Timotheus combines the elements of effeminacy, slavishness, and cowardice that characterize the Barbarian. Here, he follows upon the lead of Aeschylus.

In the Greek soldier's treatment of the Phrygian, Timotheus also highlights the effeminate, cowardly, and slavish nature of the Persians. Refusing to heed the Phrygian's pleas for mercy, the Greek grabs him by the hair and drags him away. This motif appears often in tragedy, where it is invariably used of women, primarily of women being led off into slavery.[81] By using it here of the Phrygian captive, Timotheus points to his womanish character. Timotheus also points to the slavish demeanour of the Phrygian not only in the motif of grabbing his hair, but also in his words. He refers to Xerxes as ἐμὸς δεσπότης, "my master" (*PMG* 791.152), indicating his subordinate relationship to the King.[82] The hierarchical nature of Persian culture and the obsequious behaviour of Persians to their King were standard elements in Greek portrayals of the Persians, where it stood in contrast to the freedom enjoyed by the Greeks. In his *Persians*, Timotheus presented an account of Salamis that included the standard scenes of the battle, as well as the traditional creation of the Persians as effeminate, cowardly barbarians.

---

[80] For wine as the drink of civilized men, see Pindar fr. 166 (Snell-Maehler); for its effect on the Centaurs, *Od.* 21 and Apollod. 2.5.4, where the "one good Centaur" is indicated as such by his ability to drink wine; for a Cyclops who is similarly unused to strong wine, see *Od.* 9. Compare also the Cyclopes of Euripides *Cyclopes*, who are completely inexperienced with wine.

The Phrygian indicates his barbarian nature from the moment he opens his mouth to speak, uttering execrable Greek. Language is one of the defining characteristics of Greeks and Barbarians, and the comic poets were fond of putting on-stage barbarian characters, indicated as such, in part, by their inability to speak proper Greek. Barbarians in comedy would speak either gibberish, or heavily accented Greek; their language was used to mark them as Others, as those lacking Hellenic *paideia*.[83] Barbarians in tragedy generally spoke correct, unaccented, Greek, albeit Greek that was said to be in a barbarian language.[84]

---

[81] G. Italie noted that seizing an individual by the hair is a legal manner to take possession (quoted in Janssen 1989, 101). See also Richard Kannicht, ed., *Euripides: Helena*, vol. 2. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1969), 48. For instances of this motif, see n. 132.

[82] Compare the "drowning Persian" who refers to Xerxes as ἐμὸς ἄναξ, "my lord" (*PMG* 791.76).

[83] Stephen Colvin, "The Language of Non-Athenians in Old Comedy," in *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, eds., David Harvey and John Wilkins (London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2000), 287-8. See also Timothy Long, *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986), 136-7.

That the Phrygian does speak such abysmal Greek, a trait common to comedy but not to tragedy, has led Ebeling to assert that the scene is intended to be comic. He states "Timotheus leads up to the threshold of butchery, and then achieves a comic climax in letting the unfortunate man from Celaenae plead for his life in broken Ionic."[85] I think that this reading is mistaken and that Timotheus presents a very chilling scene in which a helpless captive does all that he can to save his own life. It is not a funny scene, but rather a piteous and frightening one. It points to one of the horrors of war: the slaughter of the helpless.[86] As they listened, the audience would likely recall a similar scene in Aeschylus' *Persae* where the poet presented a detailed, and in no way amusing, description of the butchery on the island (*PMG* 791.457-64). Ominous music playing in the background could serve to heighten the terror and suspense. Had we the *Persians'* music, we might more readily decide whether the scene was comic or tragic. The scene contributes to the characterization of the Persians as Other in that the Persian is seen to be pleading for his life in an unheroic and indeed unGreek manner.

From his negative portrayal of the Persians as Barbarians, Timotheus turns to condemn their gods, country, and King as impotent. He makes explicit the fact that their gods and their country are powerless, and their King unwilling, to save them. Persian soldiers, their ships destroyed, wash up on the beaches. There, awaiting their slaughter by the Greeks, they call upon their country to save them, but to no avail (*PMG* 791.105-9).[87] Another appeal, from a new speaker, follows a few lines later. This speaker invokes Cybele, the Mountain Mother (*PMG* 791.121-2), with the same lack of result as his drowning comrade. In the face of Greek hoplites and the Greek navy, the Persian gods and King are helpless.

---

[84] Hall 1989, 118.

[85] Ebeling 1925, 312; for similar sentiments, see Francis 1980, 79 and Hordern 2002, 205-6.

[86] Compare the condemnation of the sacrifice of Polyxena and the murder of Astyanax in Euripides' *Trojan Women*.

Timotheus draws a sharp contrast between the relative might and favour of the Greek and Persian gods. While Artemis and Cybele are unable, or perhaps unwilling, to save their Persian suppliants, the Greek gods are quick to help their own suppliants. Aeschylus indicates that prior to the battle of Salamis, the Athenians sang a paean to Apollo (*Persae* 386-94). Timotheus records that the Athenians sang a paean of thanksgiving after the battle (*PMG* 791.196-8); he may also have included the paean that preceded the battle (*PMG* 800). The request to "shoot arrows upon our enemies" (πέμψον ἑκαβόλον ἐχθροῖσ‹ι› βέλος σᾶς ἀπὸ νευρᾶς) suits the context of a battle while Apollo's role at Salamis is suggested by the paean of thanksgiving that closes the battle scene. This makes it probable that Timotheus included a reference to, if not the text of, the paean the Greeks sang prior to the battle. Apollo's favour and his granting of the Greek request can be inferred from the successful outcome of the naval battle. Unlike the Persian god Cybele, the Greek gods are both willing and able to help their suppliants. (We can infer that Artemis' lack of intervention on the part of the Persian results not from any lack of will or power, but rather from her assistance of the Greeks, her preferred combatants.)

---

[87] The following lines are lacunose but contain an imperative (ἄπεχε *PMG* 791.113) which might indicate that the Persian continues his appeal.

As the speakers bewail their fate and call upon their gods for the help that does not come, the Greeks appear, swords in hand, to commence the slaughter. That the sword does not fall within the text allows the Greeks, secure in the knowledge of the circumstances of the victory, to savour the moment of their victory. Timotheus exploits both the Greek historical victory and the cultural image of the Greek as dominant: the Greek soldier's sword is always poised to strike and he retains the perpetual power of life and death over those Persians forever abjectly begging for their lives. For the same reason, the beach is always full of bewailing Persians and the waters of Salamis are always full of sinking ships. The battle continuously plays in the background, despite the closure implied by the dedicatory offerings (*PMG* 791.196-201). The Greeks remain on the pinnacle of their triumph and never descend from its heights.

Just as the Greeks remain at the height of their power, so does Xerxes remain on his knees, locked in the moment when he realized the destruction of his dreams (*PMG* 791.173-86). Seeing his forces and his plans destroyed, Xerxes collapses to his knees (γονυπετής), a position usually reserved for his subordinates, beating his breast and rending his clothes (αἴκιζε σῶμα) in a womanish display of sorrow. As a typical gold-loving Persian, he then quickly turns to more important things, making the necessary preparations for the safe transport back to Persia of his wealth. Although Xerxes gives the order to ready the gold for retreat, Timotheus does not permit their departure. Instead, he freezes Xerxes in his moment of grief and position of subordination and defeat, crystallizing the moment of Greek victory at its time of greatest triumph. Allowing Xerxes to rise and his orders to retreat to Persia to be fulfilled, and allowing the Greeks to kill their Persian captives, would be somewhat anticlimactic.

Juxtaposed with the scenes of mass destruction of the Persians is a brief scene of the victory celebration of the Greeks. With a οἱ δὲ, 'but the others,' Timotheus pivots sharply from the destruction of the Persians to the celebration of the Greeks who now take the field. The Persian screams and cries of sorrow give way to Greek cries of joy and thanksgiving (*PMG* 791.196-201). To this point, in the extant portion, the Greeks have been silent. We do, however, have Greek speech from the missing opening section of the poem. A Greek exhorts the others to "respect Honour" (*PMG* 789) and asserts, "Greece does not fear gold" (*PMG* 790).[88] Timotheus may have opened with advice to the Greek forces, advice that is equally applicable to his audience; he then turned to describe how those sentiments were put into practice as he describes the Greeks' defeat of the Persians. When the Greeks do speak again, it is to celebrate their success.

The Greeks' cries are jubilant and in marked contrast to the sounds of death and despair of the Persian forces. The beating of the earth (ἐπεκτύπεον) by the dancing Greeks contrasts with the beating of the breasts (κτύπει) performed by the mourning Persians; the shared verb serves to closely link the two scenes. The offerings to the gods in recognition of their help contrasts with the Persian gods who were powerless to help; the bridge, which Xerxes built to facilitate his destruction (alluded to in *PMG* 791.72-4), is opposed to the *temenos* the Greeks build to celebrate their victory (*PMG* 791.196-7). This juxtaposition of Greek joy and Persian misery heightens the image of Greek supremacy. This is further increased by Timotheus' appropriation of the voices of the Persians. Not only does the audience hear the joyous cries of the Greeks, they hear the Persians themselves bewailing their misfortune at the hands of these same Greeks.

---

[88] Another possibility is that the speaker of *PMG* 789 is one of the Greek gods. A "divine shout" was heard

Following so lengthy and detailed a description of the battle itself, the scene of thanksgiving is very brief. This allows the focus to remain on the monumental victory the Greeks won. Timotheus makes certain to record the Greeks' gratitude to the gods, but he does so in such a way that the accomplishments of the Greek fleet are not diminished.

THE DATE AND PLACE OF FIRST PERFORMANCE

The place of the first performance of the *Persians* has been disputed.[89] Despite the strongly Athenian topic, Wilamowitz first proposed an Ionian site (Mycale or Miletus), considering the poem to be devoid of pro-Athenian sentiments (a "Salamis ohne Athen") and the *sphragis* to contain pro-Spartan sentiments, both of which would be unwelcome to an Athenian audience.[90] In general, many critics followed Wilamowitz, joining him in rejecting Athens but disagreeing on the exact Ionian city.[91] Bassett, however, has decisively refuted the objections of Wilamowitz, pointing out the collective unsuitability of the topic to any Ionian audience: an Ionian contingent fought alongside the Persians at Salamis and shared in their defeat.[92] A poem celebrating that defeat would not be welcome to an Ionian audience, nor would it be likely to win praise for its poet.[93]

---

prior to the battle of Salamis (Aesch. *Pers.* 402-5; Hdt. 8.84).

[89] Ove Hansen provides a useful chart summarizing this debate ("On the Date and Place of the First Performance of Timotheus' *Persae*," *Philologus* 128 [1984]: 135-6).

[90] Wilamowitz 1903a, 61-5. As Janssen aptly points out, the poem is in fact a "Salamis without Salamis" since the name "Salamis" does not appear in the poem either (1984, 14). Wilamowitz later rejected his first suggestion of the Panionian festival in Mycale (63) in favour of the Panionian festival at Miletus, when it was pointed out that the Panionian festival in Mycale was not celebrated during the lifetime of Timotheus (*Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Akad.* 1 [1906], 49-50).

[91] Reinach 1903: somewhere in Ionia; K. Aron, "Beiträge zu den Persern des Timotheos," diss. Greifswald, 1920, and H.L. Ebeling, "The Persians of Timotheus," *AJP* 46 (1925): Ephesus, at the Ephesia; Lesky 1966: Miletus. Hordern summarizes the evidence, but declines to speculate on the date or place of first performance (2002, 14-17).

[92] Bassett 1931. For the role of the Ionians at Salamis, see Hdt. 8.10.2 and 8.85.1-2. Although Herodotus does mention that not all Ionians were willing allies of the Persians, their defeat would not be a welcome

Bassett also strongly argued for Athens as the place of first performance, demonstrating the praise of Athens implicit in the extant poem.[94] The image of Greek victory which, rather than that of Persian distress, closes the battle narrative (*PMG* 791.196-201) and the reaction of the crowd to Philopoemen's entry at Nemea suggest that the poem did highlight the role of the Greeks, despite their absence in the extant papyrus text. Timotheus' long-awaited victory at Athens with that poem, which ensured his subsequent lasting fame, implies that the Athenians dominated the Greek role.[95] To this, we can add the enduring significance of Salamis in the funeral orations.[96]

Two points remain to be added to Bassett's discussion of this issue in support of Athens as the place of first performance. Bassett notices a compliment to the Spartans in the *sphragis*, where Timotheus describes the Spartans as "well-born," "great leaders," and "flourishing in youth" (*PMG* 791.206-8) and reads this as a prelude to Timotheus' defense of himself against earlier Spartan criticisms of his poetry; Timotheus goes on to ally himself with the great poets Orpheus and Terpander and implies a dearth of comparable Spartan poets.[97] Timotheus' criticism of the Spartans in fact goes deeper than

---

topic despite the intervening years. A defeat in an unpopular war, or in a war in which one is an unwilling participant, is still a defeat.

[93] The Milesian Timotheus could nonetheless be capable of composing a poem on this subject. Poets could temper their own sentiments to suit the taste of audiences and patrons.

[94] The Nemean audience of 207 was said to be sufficiently familiar with the *Persians* to recognize it from its opening line. This suggests that the *Persians* was re-performed often. Other re-performances of Timotheus' work include his dithyramb, *Elpenor* (*PMG* 779), which was performed at the Great Dionysia in 319 (*IG* 2^2 3055). Timotheus was a standard school text in Arcadia, to be learned after a thorough grounding in the traditional hymns and paeans (Polyb. 4.20.8-9). His poems may also have formed part of Nero's repertoire (Suet. *Nero* 21.2, 39.3). See also West 1992, 381-2.

[95] Bassett 1931, 154-7.

[96] See my discussion of Loraux' and Thomas' analyses of the funeral orations (page 13).

[97] Bassett 1931, 162-3. When Timotheus had earlier attempted to compete at the Carnea with a lyre that had too many strings, he was invited by the ephors to cut away the strings that exceeded the traditional seven (Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 17.238c). See also Paus. 3.12.10, Dio Chr. 33.411 and Cic. *Leg.* 2.15.39. Athenaeus recounts a similar anecdote, altering the ending significantly: Timotheus is acquitted when he points to a lyre of Apollo with the same excessive number of strings (*Deip.* 14.636e). Terpander (Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 17)

this. While he does open with an apparent kind word for the Spartans, he immediately counters this with sharp criticism of, and a defense against, their earlier treatment of his poetry, complaining that they viciously attack him for dishonouring the ancient Music with his new songs (*PMG* 791.209-12). He then defiantly points out that he is continuing to write in the very style which they had condemned and justifies his actions: rather than defiling the Muse he, in the tradition of Orpheus and Terpander, defends her from her corrupters (*PMG* 791.215-33). The Spartans, who attempt to prevent him from defending the Muse through the new style of his music, may be classed with the corrupters of the Muse against whom Timotheus sets himself. Both parties can then be seen as harming the Muse – either through actively corrupting her, or else through preventing her defense by Timotheus. Timotheus does not only compliment the Spartans; instead, he condemns them for their lack of musical and poetic vision.

Such a statement would also offer the Athenians the opportunity to distance themselves from the Spartans and their lack of musical vision by publicly registering their approval of Timotheus' music by awarding him the victory. Timotheus had had some previous trouble with Athenian critics, and the mention of the Spartans would offer the Athenian critics the chance to reconsider their earlier opinion to avoid aligning themselves with the benighted Spartan critics.

Timotheus concludes his defense and praise of his artistic endeavours and summons Apollo and his attendant favour to the host city, bringing them peace that is flourishing with *eunomia* (*PMG* 791.236-40). Some read the mention of *eunomia* as

---

and Phrynis (Plut. *Prof. Virt.* 13) are said to have met with a similar reaction while in Sparta. Edmonds suggests that the story, if true, would belong to Phrynis as the lesser-known poet (1927, 269 n.4). For the decree of the Spartans against Timotheus, see Giovanni Marzi, "Il 'decreto' degli Spartani contro Timoteo praise of Sparta, indicative of the presence of Spartans in the audience and, consequently, as a mark against Athenian performance.[98] In Sparta, *eunomia* signified those structures and policies set in place to ensure social harmony, primarily through the subordination of the individual to the *polis*. Lycurgus, the traditional founder of *eunomia*, was credited with reorganizing the army, instituting the messes, and establishing the *ephors* and the Council of Elders as safeguards for the Spartan way-of-life. This is clearly apocryphal, since the various institutions evolved overtime, some being borrowed from other city-states; nonetheless, the tradition is indicative of the importance of *eunomia*. By crediting it to a legendary ancestor, *eunomia* is sanctified by age and tradition.[99]

In response to those seeing the mention of *eunomia* as indicative of a Spartan presence, Bassett proposes that this be read as a pun on the term's musical connotations rather than explicit praise of Spartan social policy.[100] Timotheus' pun in fact goes deeper. Timotheus appropriates the term that had one meaning in Sparta and applies it to his own musical endeavours, which the Spartans had condemned, and thus ends the *Persians* with oblique praise of his own "good harmony" and veiled condemnation of Spartan musical tastes and their failure to recognize his skill.

Eunomia was not confined to Spartan society. It was a politically positive term, not associated with any one *polis*, found as early as Homer (*Od.* 17.487) and Hesiod (*Th.* 902). More significantly, Solon could use the term in a poem for the Athenians in which he set out the conditions of an ideal state (*IEG*^{2} 4): such a state is one in which *eunomia*

(Beoth., 'de Instit. Mus.' 1.1)," in *Musica in Greca*, eds. Bruno Gentili and Roberto Pretagostini (Rome: Laterza, 1988), 264-72.

[98] Wilamowitz 1903, 64; Reinach 1903, 76 n.2; Croiset 1903, 325; Ebeling 1925, 331.

[99] Compare the Athenians' tendency to credit laws to Solon.

rules, making it just and well-ordered and enabling it to thrive.[101] The term never passed fully into Spartan control. While Herodotus does suggest its Spartan associations by using the term with reference to the reforms of Lycurgus (1.65), he is able in the next book to use it of Egyptian society under Rhampsinitus in contrast to that under Cheops (2.124). Pindar could use it to refer to the good government in an ode for Cyrene (*Pyth.* 5.67). Both Sophocles (*Ajax* 712) and Plato (*Resp.* 4.425a) used it without reference to Sparta, while Athens had an altar to Eunomia ca. 465.[102] In the *Persians*, following closely upon the mention of Sparta, the term does seem to have politically-charged overtones. It is nevertheless better read, especially considering Timotheus' sharp criticisms of Sparta, as a pun with musical as well as social and political connotations.

The term *nomos* has a dual usage, referring to law or custom and also to musical style. Essentially, it signified order of any kind, especially order that was "valid and binding" on those concerned.[103] To the Greeks of the fifth century and later the musical connotation of the term was in some way "connected with a strict adherence to rules or 'laws' governing the musical forms by which, in earlier times, these pieces had been characterized."[104] The earliest uses of *nomos* do point to its connotation as "law," in which Eunomia, as a divine personification, is the daughter of Themis, and the sister of

---

[100] Bassett 1931, 163. Dietmar Korzeniewski ("Die Binnenresponsion in den *Persern* des Timotheos," *Philologus* 118 [1974]: 23) and Herington (1985, 275-6 n.35) accept Bassett's suggestion.

[101] For an analysis of the political and ethical themes in Solon fr. 4 *IEG*^{2}, see Emily Katz Anhalt, *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics* (Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1993), 67-114.

[102] M.L. West, ed., *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), 407.

[103] Martin Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969), 20.

[104] Andrew Barker, *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. 1, *The Musician and his Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 249. See also Plato, *Laws* 700a-701b; 799e. The connection of law and music allows Plato and other music critics to denounce those who compose in the style of the New Music not simply as vulgar or inartistic, but as lawbreakers out to destroy the very fabric of society (*Laws* 800a-b).

Peace and Justice (*Th.* 901-2). The sisters, Peace and Justice, then are to accompany Apollo to the city at the close of Timotheus' poem (*PMG* 791.240).

Nomos can appear in compounds with both senses of the word. Aeschylus can use the word of both an unlawful sacrifice (θυσίαν ἑτε/ραν ἄνομόν τιν᾽ ἄδαιτον, "a second unlawful and unfeasted sacrifice" [*Ag.* 151-2]) and a tuneless song (θροεῖς / νόμον ἄνομον [*Ag.* 1142-3]). Plato plays with the dual sense of *nomos* when he urges the guardians to guard against lawlessness in music since that lawlessness results in music that is not only counter to the laws of society but also to the laws of music itself (*Rep.* 424b-425a). A comparable play on the two meanings of *nomos* is found in Plato's extended discussion of the collapse of society resulting from the new freedoms in music (*Laws* 700e-701a).

Janssen dismisses the possibility of a pun on the sense of *eunomia* as a "tactical error" and "farfetched."[105] He instead reads it as a "purely traditional" ending, on analogy with *h.Hym.* 8.16-7, wherein the poet ends his song with a request for a peaceful life.[106] A purely traditional ending is highly unlikely, given the pride that Timotheus takes in the novelty of his poetry; furthermore, the presence of a purely traditional ending in the *sphragis*, where he made explicit the newness of his art, is counterproductive. Finally, the emphatic placement of *eunomia* argues against it being "purely traditional." Timotheus thus appropriates *eunomia*, a neutral term but one capable of conveying Spartan overtones—especially when following on the mention of the Spartans and the extended discussion of them and their musical tastes—and redefines it to pun on its musical connotations; thus he deprives the Athenians and, retroactively, the Spartans, of one weapon against his art. A city in which good harmony is flourishing is one that accepts his own harmonious style. The mention of *eunomia* cannot therefore be taken as evidence against Athenian performance and in favour of Spartan performance. The pun, with its veiled condemnation of Sparta, rather implies Athenian performance, as do the very topic and Timotheus' success with the *Persians* at Athens. We can, therefore, conclude that the *Persians* was first performed at Athens.

---

[105] Janssen 1989, 20 and 148; compare Hordern who sees "no evidence that the final lines of the poem are still concerned with Timotheus' musical defence" and instead reads it as a conventional prayer (2002, 248).

[106] Janssen 1989, 20.

In addition to determining the place of first performance, Bassett has also been influential in determining its date. Using anecdotal and internal evidence, Bassett places the first performance of the *Persians* between 412 (Persia's entry into the Peloponnesian war as the financial backers of Sparta) and 408 (Euripides' departure from Athens). Bassett's ideas have been largely and unquestioningly accepted, with some subsequent scholars seeking to pinpoint a date of composition within that time frame by reference to contemporary historical events.[107] The date of composition could then be used to account for Timotheus' victory with the *Persians*: the Athenians, in the midst of the Peloponnesian War, rewarded Timotheus not for the style but rather for the substance of his poem which recalled to them, during a long and drawn-out war, their greatest victory. These dates, however, reflect a misreading of the history of the New Music and of Timotheus' place in its development; this misreading also results in a mistaken significance for the *Persians* and reasons for its success. The reasons for rejecting the conclusions of Bassett and his followers will now be examined.

---

[107] Francis (1980, 53), Hansen (1984, 137 n.11), Herington (1985, 159 and 276 n.37), Janssen (1989, 16 and 22), G.F. Brussich ("L'inno ad Artemide di Timoteo," *QUCC* 34 [1990], 29), and van Minnen (1997, 252) all accept Bassett's arguments for the dating of Timotheus. C.W. Willink also accepts the influence of Timotheus on Euripides (ed., *Euripides: Orestes* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1986], lix), as does Hall 1989, 119. Hansen goes further, seeking to pinpoint the exact date of the composition: "Something important that happened during the period 412-408 B.C. must be pointed out as the cause for Timotheus to write his *Persae*" (137); Hansen finds it in the Athenian victory at Cyzicus in 411/0 and the full restoration of democracy.

Bassett supports 412 as the *terminus post quem* with reference to *PMG* 790, χρυσὸν Ἑλλὰς οὐ δέδοικε, "Greece does not fear gold," reading it as an allusion to the Persians' financial support of the Spartan navy. A reference to Persian gold, however, needs no contemporary reference. Wealth in general and gold in particular were defining features of the Persian character and empire as well as forming an integral part of the story of the Persian Wars.[108] Throughout the *Persians* Timotheus presents the standard picture of the Persians, including their characterization as a nation obsessed with wealth and the trappings of it, to the exclusion of all other matters including Persian lives.[109] Seeing his navy routed, Xerxes briefly laments the destruction of his plans and his navy and then quickly breaks off to begin his retreat, taking the appropriate precautions for the protection of the ubiquitous Persian wealth, insisting that it be packed up and carted away, lest the Greeks capture it and benefit (*PMG* 791.191-5).[110]

Xerxes' concern that the Greeks not derive any benefit from his gold might, on the surface, appear to support Bassett's contention that at the date of the first performance this same gold was supporting the Spartans against the Athenians. Nevertheless, it is more naturally read as a reference to the benefit all the Greeks, including the Athenians, derived from the spoils received after their defeat of the Persians.[111] The references in the *Persians* to the wealth of the Persian empire are both historically and psychologically accurate as well as artistically consistent; they correspond to those found in Aeschylus and reflect the Athenian concept of the Barbarian. Timotheus, as a poet, needed no external political inspiration to write the poem; he wanted public endorsement of his musical style through a victory in a musical competition and, reading his audience well, selected something he knew would virtually guarantee a victory: their greatest battle of which they never tired of hearing. While poets could certainly reflect contemporary events in their songs (e.g., Euripides' *Trojan Women* and the Athenian actions on Melos) not all poetry is composed in response to current events. A reference to the wealth of the Persians is standard in descriptions of the Persians in general and the Persian Wars in particular and is not sufficient to date the *Persians*.

---

[108] Hall discusses Aeschylus' use of gold to define the Persians (1989, 80-1) and notes that great wealth is a defining characteristic of many non-Greek civilizations, citing in particular plays treating the Trojan cycle (127-8).

[109] A similar sentiment is found in Aeschylus' *Persae* (845-51) where the Persian Queen is disturbed more by the thought of Xerxes appearing in rags than she is by the news of the slaughter of the Persian forces.

[110] Timotheus' audience would, of course, know that they did in fact capture and benefit from Persian spoils. Xerxes' last words and his concerns are in vain; this detail further highlights the impotence of the Persians.

The evidence Bassett uses to date the poem to before 408 is equally weak: Timotheus influenced Euripides, who in turn composed the proem for the *Persians;* such a relationship could only occur prior to Euripides' departure from Athens. Bassett supports this with reference to the anecdotal tradition and perceived similarities between the poets' work. According to the former, the poets were contemporaries and Euripides cheered up Timotheus who was despondent to the point of suicide over his repeated critical failures; Euripides may also have composed the proem for the *Persians* (Sat. *Vit. Eur.* [=*POxy.* 1176.39 col. xxii.27-30]). According to the latter, the similarities between the poets who, to varying degrees, incorporated features of the New Music into their poetry could have resulted only from the direct influence of Timotheus on Euripides.[112]

---

[111] Margaret Miller notes that there are no detailed ancient descriptions of the Persian spoils extant but that a large proportion of it was in gold and silver; she also notes that we can infer the extent of it and its impact on Athens from Thucydides 2.13.3-5. In his record of Athens' financial resources prior to the Peloponnesian War Timotheus makes special mention of "Persian spoils." Miller notes "even after massive construction programmes and major losses, what remained of Athens' share of the booty was worthy of

Wilamowitz found similarities to the *Persians* in the *Phoenissae* (produced ca. 410), specifically in the medley of rhythms and the astrophic nature of the arias of Jocasta (301-54) and Antigone (1485-538), and in the *Orestes* (produced 408) to the arias of Electra (982-1012) and the Phrygian (1370-502).[113] From this, he concluded that Timotheus must have influenced Euripides.[114] Bassett accepted this and asserted, "[t]his influence could hardly have been exerted before the performance and success of the *Persians*" since Euripides could not risk the "failure of his tragedies by introducing features, which the despised Timotheus had made unpopular."[115] This is an *a priori* argument, assuming from the start that Euripides' interest in the New Music derived from Timotheus rather than from his own exposure to a musical style that was gaining ground in Athens. More significantly, it fails to take into account Timotheus' position in the development of the New Music. Both Wilamowitz and Bassett equate Timotheus with the New Music, ascribing to him sole responsibility for the entire phenomenon. Timotheus was, however, not the originator of the movement, or the architect of all of its

---

specific budgetary consideration" (1997, 29). She catalogues the nature of the spoils Athens received from the Persian Wars and later skirmishes as well as their long-term social impact (29-62).

[112] Timotheus composed in the style of the New Music exclusively, while Euripides adapted some of its features to the framework of tragedy.

[113] For the evidence dating the *Phoenissae* to the period 411-409, see Donald J. Mastronarde, ed., *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 11-14. The *Orestes* is dated to 408 (the archonship of Diocles) by a scholiast on lines 371-2.

[114] "Aber ausserhalb des Dithyrambus, der erst in seinem letzten Stadium dem immer überwiegenden Chorgesänge Einzellieder eingefügt hat, hat es so viel wir wissen im 5. Jahrhundert keine bedeutende Aulodie gegeben, aus der sich die Einführung der durchkomponierten Arien in die Tragödie erklären könnte, die ausserdem zeitlich mit der Blüte der Kitharodie zusammenfällt. Daher ist es wahrscheinlich, dass Timotheos auf Euripides gewirkt hat, wie andererseits die Beeinflussung der Kitharodie durch das Drama oben bei der Metrik anerkannt werden musste" (Wilamowitz 1903a, 101).

[115] Bassett 1931, 159-60.

characteristics. Instead, Timotheus stood towards the end of the movement and, although he is heralded as its greatest practitioner (or worst - depending upon your perspective), he was neither the movement's sole voice nor its first.

Despite the evidence for the early developments of the characteristics of the New Music, elements of the New Music in Euripides' poetry are cited as evidence of Timothean influence.[116] As we have seen, this is untenable. Characteristics of the New Music appeared early in authors who, if sufficiently familiar to Aristophanes and his audience to form the basis of jokes, should also be familiar to Euripides. Furthermore, he had himself experimented with astrophic and polymetric composition as early as his *Hecuba* (ca. 424). There is no need to cite Timotheus as the sole influence on Euripides, and thus no need to date the *Persians* to sometime prior to the production of the *Orestes*.[117]

Furthermore, the anecdotal evidence that Bassett cites actually contradicts his position: Euripides appears not as the protégé of Timotheus, but as his champion who not only ensures that Timotheus continue to write in the style of the New Music, but also makes an important contribution to his success with that style. Satyrus states that Euripides cheered up a depressed Timotheus and composed the proem for the *Persians*, the poem with which Timotheus finally silenced his detractors (*POxy.* 1176.36 col.

---

[116] Wilamowitz 1903a, 101; Bassett 1931, 159-60. For the developments in the New Music, see pages 215-219.

[117] Further evidence for the growing interest in the New Music is the appearance of its characteristics in Sophocles. Sophocles too adopted features of the new trends in music, in particular astrophic and polymetric composition, in his later plays; see e.g., *Philoctetes* 1169-217 (produced 409) and *Oedipus at Colonus* 207-53 (produced ca. 401) (West 1982, 136 n.148); for a metrical analysis of sections of the *Philoctetes*, see West 1982, 136. In his *Life* of Sophocles, Satyrus cites the fourth-century theorist Aristoxenus as proof that Sophocles was the first to use "Phrygian *melopoeia* and the dithyrambic topos" (23 [=Aristoxenus fr. 79 Wehrli]). For Aristoxenus' musical theory and the evidence for his writings, see Mathiesen 1999, 294-344.

xxii).[118] That Euripides, a novice to the New Music, could compose the proem for a successful *nomos* in the style of the New Music is doubtful. A similar account appears in Plutarch who credits Euripides with cheering up a depressed Timotheus (*an seni.* 23). Taken at face value, these anecdotes put Euripides in the dominant role, calling into question the theory that Timotheus influenced Euripides.[119]

Bassett states "there remains one play of Euripides, the *Orestes* . . . in which the influence of the *Persians* is so pronounced that if we had no other evidence than the papyrus fragment of the latter poem–if there were no biographical anecdote connecting Euripides with Timotheus–we should be justified in inferring some literary relation."[120] The literary evidence advanced by Bassett to support Timothean influence, however, is not compelling.[121] Bassett identifies a number of similarities between the *Orestes* and the *Persians* that he sees as Timothean influence, primarily in the speech of Helen's Phrygian slave at *Orestes* 1366-502 and the captured Phrygian's pleas for mercy at *Persians* 139-61. These similarities are, however, either characteristics of the New Music as a whole, or are simply standard scenes common to Euripides and tragedy, and so should not be taken as an indebtedness to Timotheus.[122]

---

[118] Ove Hansen has identified *PMG* fr. adesp. 1018 as Euripides' proem to the *Persians*, citing the metrical coincidence between the *Persians* and the prayer, the suitability of the prayer to the context of the poem, and the ring composition with the final section of the *Persians* ("The So-Called Prayer to the Fates and Timotheus' *Persae*," *RhM* 133 [1990]: 190-2). Bowra, however, favours Simonidean authorship and thinks the poem was written for the cult of the Fates at Corinth (1961, 404-15).

[119] One other tradition linking the two poets is that Timotheus composed the epitaph for Euripides (*FGE* 307-8). Thucydides, however, is also suggested as the author (*Vit. Eur.*; compare *AP* 7.4 and Athen. 5.187d who omit Timotheus, crediting only Thucydides as its author). Thucydides is perhaps to be preferred as the author: as a historian and someone who was not associated with Euripides, it would have been a greater leap for the sources to have invented him as the author than it would have been for them to seize upon the poet with whom Euripides was thought to have been associated. As well, the description ‛Ελλάδος ‛Ελλὰς ’Αθῆναι, "Athens is the Greece of Greece" has some echo of Thucydides' account of Pericles' funeral oration: λέγω τήν τε πᾶσαν πόλιν τῆς ‛Ελλάδος παίδευσιν εἶναι, "I say that Athens is the teacher of Greece" (Thuc. 2.41.1).

[120] Bassett 1931, 160. He examines the evidence at pages 160-1.

[121] Csapo 1999-2000, esp. 406-12.

Bassett argues that the astrophic arrangements and the medley of rhythms are evidence of Timothean influence. As already discussed, these features were characteristic of the New Music as a whole rather than of Timotheus specifically and were inherited by Timotheus from his predecessors. As further evidence, Bassett cites the similar situations in the *Persians* and the *Orestes*, such as the motif of an Eastern power falling to the Greeks. This is not itself unique, but instead had become a common *topos* after the Persian Wars as the Persians took on the role analogous to the mythical monsters as enemies of Greece and civilization.[123] The theme of an Eastern power falling to the Greeks forms the centre of Aeschylus' *Persae* that not only preceded the poems of both Euripides and Timotheus, but also provided Timotheus with much material, as well as an outline of events and the character of the Persians. The degradation of character exhibited by the enemies of Athens, found in both the *Orestes* and the *Persians*, also informs much of the *Persae*.

Bassett also points out the similar dramatic *personae* in the poems, noting in particular the character of the cowardly Phrygian: "[t]he use of a foreigner, an arrant coward by contrast with Greeks, is not found in extant Greek tragedy or lyric except the

---

[122] Francis states "Euripides directly acknowledges his debt to Timotheus in his characterization of the Phrygian captive in *Orestes* 1369ff" (1980, 55 n.8). John R. Porter also accepts, for the most part, Bassett's arguments for the priority of the *Persians* over the *Orestes*, referring to the "clear debt" of the *Orestes* to the *Persians*, and the "convincing" case of Bassett that is "argued conclusively" (*Studies in Euripides' "Orestes"* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994], 199-204). He then does a dramatic about-face, stating "[w]hile it is tempting to see in Timotheus' poem the origin of *Orestes* 1503ff (particularly given the similarities in tone, outlook and style in the two works), such a connection cannot be proven" (244). Csapo states that there is "clearly some borrowing" between the two poems but is unsure as to which poet borrowed from the other (2000, 406).

[123] Hall 1989, 62-9. Hall observes, "it was the fifth century which invented the notion of the barbarian as the universal anti-Greek against whom Hellenic—especially Athenian—culture was defined" (5).

Orestes and the *Persians*."[124] The *Persae*, however, also has a direct contrast between the Persians and the Greeks (e.g., 391-4, where terror falls on the Persians when they hear the Greek paean and perceive that the Greeks, rather than fleeing, are preparing to attack). A similar contrast between the bravery of Greeks and foreigners is found in Euripides' *Iphigenia at Tauris* (produced ca. 414[125]) where Euripides presents a group of Taurian herdsmen who are afraid to attack the dramatically outnumbered Orestes and Pylades. The herdsmen explicitly identify themselves as cowards who are only able to overcome the pair through strength of numbers and the judicious application of stones.[126]

The *Orestes'* cowardly Phrygian eunuch who abandons his mistress to her attackers and begs for his own life (1369-536) is not comparable to the *Persians'* Phrygian soldier who had fought valiantly prior to his capture and who begged for his life only when defenseless and personally menaced by a sword-wielding Greek (*PMG* 791.152-73).[127] Furthermore Orestes, to whom the cowardly Euripidean Phrygian stands in contrast, displays a similar cowardice with respect to his own life.[128] Unwilling to accept with equanimity his sentence of death, he plots to kill Helen or Hermione in an attempt to win either support from Menelaus in commuting his sentence or else posthumous fame (1172-5). Although he does act decisively in his attempt to save his life rather than simply begging for mercy, his plan is rather cowardly: he and a friend, both armed, ambush an unarmed woman guarded by eunuchs.[129]

---

[124] Bassett, 161 n.4. This contrast is, however, found in epic. During the *Doloneia*, Dolon is contrasted with Diomedes and Odysseus, "...in particular, his recklessness and cowardice. Here a foreigner is outwitted and humiliated by two Greeks, a pattern which was to become popular in the tragedians, and although Book 10 may well represent a later stage of the epic tradition than much of the rest of the *Iliad*, it is impossible to push it further forward than the sixth century" (Hall 1989, 32).

[125] Martin Cropp dates the play to 414 or 413 on the basis of metrical considerations (M.J. Cropp, ed., *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris* [Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2000], 60-1).

[126] In the *IT*, the cowardly messenger speeches celebrate the superiority of the Greeks both physically and intellectually (Hall 1989, 124).

[127] Although the extant portion opens towards the end of the battle when the Athenians have already defeated the Persians, we can assume a valiant fight by the Persians since the defeat of poor and cowardly fighters would detract from the accomplishments of the Greeks.

[128] That Euripides chose a Phrygian as Helen's cowardly slave is not itself significant. In Euripides' plays, Phrygia is a synonym for Troy (e.g., *Andromache* [produced 445] 194, 204, 291; *Hecuba* [produced ca. 423] 4, 349-50, 482, 776, 827, 1061, 1111, and 1141; and *Cyclops* (produced ca. 411-408] 200-4. Phrygia also appears in his non-Trojan plays, e.g., *Alcestis* 675. The *Orestes*' Helen, returning from Troy,

The similar situations in the two poems that Bassett cites, such as supplication performed by grasping the knees of one's would-be benefactor, deaths that are not shown on stage, and grasping a person by the hair are common scenes in tragedy rather than inspiration from Timotheus. Supplications performed by grasping the knees are first found in Homer and are common in tragedy;[130] death never occurs on-stage.[131] The death of the Phrygian in the *Persians*, virtually certain to have occurred from Herodotus' description of the historical context of the slaughter of the Persians on the island of Psyttaleia, is not narrated, although this is not proscribed by the conventions of the *nomos*. Nonetheless, the foreshadowed death of the Phrygian, like those of his comrades, fits in with the general tendencies of the poem in which at no point is death explicitly

---

understandably brought with her a number of Phrygian (i.e., Trojan) slaves. (For the dating of the *Cyclops*, see Richard Seaford, "The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*," *JHS* 102 [1982]: 161-72.)

[129] M.J. O'Brien notes that both Orestes and the Phrygian are motivated by a desire for survival and that Orestes' appeal to Menelaus (678-9) is essentially a paraphrase of the Phrygian's appeal at 1527 ("The Authenticity of *Orestes* 1503-1536," in *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*, eds., Martin Cropp, Elaine Fantham, and S.E. Scully [Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986], 220). Willink too notes the lack of heroic stature displayed by Orestes who places a higher value on saving his own life than on the traditional precept of glory and harming one's enemies (1986, li). For the ethical principal of harming one's enemies, see Mary Whitlock Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophoclean Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 26-59.

[130] In his thorough discussion of the social and religious aspects of supplication, John Gould notes that touching the knees is restricted to acts of supplication ("Hiketeia," *JHS* 93 [1973]: 76 with n.14). An act of supplication sets in motion the action of the *Iliad*, where Thetis prevails upon Zeus to grant military supremacy to the Trojans, and ends the poem with the visit of Priam to Achilles. Euripides himself used it often in plays that predate the *Persians* (*Med.* 710, *And.* 895, *Hec.* 787, *Suppl.* 165, and *Ph.* 1622). One significant difference between the two scenes of supplication is the different outcome: Orestes releases the Phrygian slave; the Greek soldier, presumably, does not free his captive.

[131] *Inter alios* Agamemnon and Cassandra, and later Clytemnestra, are taken indoors to die (*Oresteia*, produced 458), while Pentheus is dismembered out of the audience's sight (*Bacchae*, produced 408).

described. Finally, Bassett cites as a parallel between the two texts the scene in which Orestes seizes Helen by the hair prior to his attempt to kill her (1469) while in the *Persians* a Greek soldier does the same to the Phrygian (*PMG* 791.156). While it is not a common occurrence in tragedy, the motif nonetheless occurs fairly often.[132] It is also an early image and we must not look to any one author, in particular the relatively late Timotheus, as its originator. Supplication, seizing someone by the hair, and the unseen "death" of Helen need not be explained with reference to Timotheus.[133]

Just as the Phrygians differ in style, so too do they differ in substance: the Timothean one is a soldier who had fought bravely prior to his capture; the Euripidean is a eunuch and body-slave of Helen who abandoned his mistress at the entry of the sword-brandishing Orestes. What is most memorable about Timotheus' Phrygian and the greatest point of contrast to the Euripidean is not his conventional act of supplication or even his understandable fear for his life; rather, it is his execrable Greek (*PMG* 791.57-61).[134] In contrast, the Greek of Euripides' Phrygian is fluent.[135]

Bassett also advances a "striking resemblance in language and metrical form" as evidence. The resemblance, however, is not striking: he sees Timotheus' expression

---

[132] Euripides had used this motif several times prior to the *Orestes*: *Andromache* (produced ca. 425-418) 402 and 710; *Trojan Women* (produced 415) 880-2 and 896-7; and *Helen* (produced 412) 116. Prior to Euripides, Aeschylus used the motif: *Sept.* (produced 467) 326-9; and *Supp.* (produced 463) 430-2.

[133] One very good reason for not showing the death of Helen on-stage, aside from the conventions of tragedy, is that she does not in fact die. Orestes thinks he has killed her, but he is in error. Helen is rescued by Apollo and undergoes apotheosis, becoming a guardian of sailors along with her brothers (1630-42).

[134] For example, the Phrygian refers to Artemis as "Artimis." Ebeling states that these lines would have "an especial point" if the poem was performed at the Ephesia (1925, 321). In fact, these lines argue against the Ephesia as the place of performance. No god, regardless of the nationality of the suppliant, can be portrayed as impotent in a song in his or her honour.

[135] "The language of the song is articulate, high-flown, typical of late Euripidean lyric" (M.L. West, ed., *Euripides: Orestes* [Aris & Phillips, 1987], 277); Willink, "high sophistication of diction and metre, employed in a constructively operatic manner" (1986, 305). On the importance of language to define Greeks against the Barbarians, see Hall, 117-21.

’Ασιάδι φωνᾷ, "with Asian voice" (*PMG* 791.159) as the origin of Euripides' identical phrase (*Or.* 1397). Bassett suggests that Euripides is paying a compliment to his friend and capitalizing on the latest hit song, on analogy with the parallel between Sophocles' *Antigone* (905-12) and Herodotus (3.119) in which women rank a brother's life above that of a husband or child. The offered parallel between Sophocles and Herodotus is striking in that it provides an extended passage on a unique situation: the significance of a brother, who is irreplaceable if both parents are dead, and the importance of blood-ties. The two-word phrase in Euripides and Timotheus, neither word in itself striking, is not likely to have been obvious to the audience, or all that memorable to Euripides himself. Language is a traditional distinguishing characteristic between Greeks and Barbarians, and Aeschylus, Herodotus, and Choerilus all make a sharp contrast between Europe and Asia. Euripides had himself already made this very distinction in his *Trojan Women* (748; 927) produced in 414, prior to Timotheus' alleged influence.

There are a number of similarities between the two poems, but the sheer number of these similarities does not in and of itself demand that one poem be indebted to the other. The shared scenes and motifs are common enough that coincidence and the artistic needs of the texts are sufficient to explain them. If we must infer a literary relationship between the two poets, a more logical one would be Euripides influencing Timotheus. This would conform to the anecdotal tradition in which the elder Euripides had a profound effect on Timotheus, both preventing his suicide and supplying the proem for his most successful poem, and account for so many Euripidean features appearing in the

Persians.[136] It is, however, more likely that both poets built separately upon the examples from earlier poetry and the growing influence of the New Music to create their independent poems. We cannot date the poem to the period 412-408, and so cannot use the historical circumstances of that period to account for the composition or the success of the *Persians*.

Having rejected Bassett's arguments for the dating of the *Persians* to the period 412-408, and more importantly, the significance he and others derive from it, I will now examine other evidence to determine the date of the first performance of the poem. A relatively more secure *terminus ante quem* is provided by Diodorus Siculus who records that in 398 certain dithyrambic poets, including Timotheus, were in their prime: ἤκμασαν δὲ τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν οἱ ἐπισημότατοι διθυραμβοποιοί (14.46.6). The verb ἀκμάζω can be used to refer to people who are flourishing as well as to things that have metaphorical lives, such as courage as in Plato's *Protagoras* 310d, or physical strength as in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* 4.4.23. Here, it seems that Diodorus is suggesting that Timotheus' poetic fame is flourishing. Since the anecdotes, supported by the later fame of the *Persians*, indicate that it was this poem that won for Timotheus his long-coveted victory, it was likely its success that ensured his professional prime. The *Persians* would then have been performed prior to 398. Ebeling suggests that 395 forms the *terminus ante quem* for the performance of the poem, on the basis of the statement in

---

[136] "A minor point which again suggests that Euripides was aware of a debt to Timotheos is his reference to the lyre as Asiatic [*Cycl.* 443]....Timotheos came from Miletus, and to call the lyre Asiatic was a compliment to him: Euripides paid it first probably at the time when he most needed consoling" (T.B.L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* [London: Methuen, 1967], 18). This is unlikely to be a reference to Timotheus for several reasons: Timotheus was not the only "Asiatic" lyric poet; Terpander had introduced an "Asiatic lyre" as early as the seventh century (Anderson 1968, 6); there was a strong distinction drawn between Asia and Hellas following the Persian Wars, so that an allusion to Timotheus as "Asiatic" would be to put him on the wrong side; and Timotheus firmly identified himself as Achaean (*Persians* 246-8).

Plutarch that many Greeks were moved to quote from Timotheus' *Persians* (*PMG* 789) at the sight of Persians forced to conform to the frugal habits of Agesilaus.[137] This period 398-395 is in accordance with the only internal evidence for the date of the poem, Timotheus' statement ἐγὼ δ' οὔτε νέον τιν' οὔ/τε γεραὸν οὔτ' ἰσήβαν / εἴργω τῶν δ' ἑκὰς ὕμνων, "I keep not the young, nor the old, nor those my own age from my songs" (*PMG* 791.213-5). Timotheus identifies three age groups, and aligns himself with neither the old nor the young; this suggests that at the time of the first performance of the *Persians*, Timotheus was middle-aged, or between the ages of thirty to fifty years old.[138]

Support for Timotheus' fame ca. 398 is found in the anecdote that the Ephesians commissioned Timotheus to write a poem for the dedication of their temple to Artemis. Macrobius discusses the name "Opis" as a name of a companion of Artemis, and cites Alexander of Aetolia as an authority for "Opis" as a name for Artemis; Alexander recounts how it was the fame of Timotheus that compelled the Ephesians to seek him out. Alexander describes the zeal of the Ephesians for their new temple and their concern to commission a poem from one of the most talented poets (*poetae ingeniossimi)* in celebration of the event. The reputation of Timotheus convinced them to approach him specifically.

Brussich identifies the occasion as the dedication of the temple after its reconstruction because of fire damage ca. 398-395 (Eusebius *Chron.* 2.10) and dates the poem to the period 397-396.[139] Support for Brussich's date for the *Artemis* is found in an anecdote recording Cinesias' reaction to the poem. Hearing the description of Artemis as θυιάδα φοιβάδα μαινάδα λυσσάδα, "frantic, mantic, corybantic," Cinesias wished a daughter of similar disposition on Timotheus (*PMG* 778b [=Plut. *de superstit.* 10]).[140] Timotheus and Cinesias were contemporaries, which makes this occurrence possible. The performance of the poem must have occurred prior to Cinesias' death ca. 390.[141]

---

[137] Ebeling 1925, 318.

[138] Although there is an inherent danger in reading "I" as autobiographical, we can accept this statement as autobiographical since Timotheus explicitly identifies himself, by both name and nationality, as the speaker in a section clearly designed to defend and promote his artistic vision (*PMG* 791.241-8).

[139] Brussich 1990, 25-38. *Contra* Edmonds who argued that the temple was not destroyed until 356, making Timotheus' commission impossible (1927, 297 n.1).

Finally, Timotheus is associated with Archelaus from whom he receives a stipend: 'Αρχελάῳ δὲ δοκοῦντι γλισχροτέρῳ περὶ τὰς δωρεὰς εἶναι Τιμόθεος ᾄδων ἐνεσήμαινε πολλάκις τουτὶ τὸ κομμάτιον· σὺ δὲ τὸν γηγενέταν ἄργυρον αἰνεῖς. ὁ δ' 'Αρχέλαος οὐκ ἀμούσως ἀντεφώνησε, σὺ δέ γ' αἰτεῖς, "Timotheus often hinted to Archelaus that he was stingy in his gifts, singing 'you praise the earth-born silver'; Archelaus responded, not inelegantly, 'and you demand it'" (Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 334b [=*PMG* 801]). The level of detail in the anecdote, complete with a witty rejoinder of Archelaus, suggests a reasonable assurance that the two were associated and that Timotheus received a regular stipend. In order to receive his stipend and to account for the use of πολλάκις, "often," that indicates that Timotheus called attention to his financial lack on numerous occasions, Timotheus must have been a member of the court of Archelaus (413-399). It is unlikely that Archelaus would have gambled on the upcoming popularity of the rather unpopular Timotheus and so the invitation to court most likely occurred after Timotheus had achieved his poetic fame.

We can therefore conclude that at some point prior to 398 BC the *Persians* was first performed before an Athenian audience, but that the life of Euripides cannot be used to restrict it to the period 412-408.[142] The *Persians* was inspired not by current events, but rather by a desire to win and recognition of the popularity of Salamis at Athens. The public victory of the *Persians* represents a vindication of Timotheus and his artistry. Timotheus wisely selected a topic he knew would appeal to his audience and presented a rather conventional picture of that topic, despite the freedoms of the New Music.[143]

---

[140] I here use Edmunds' translation since it nicely conveys the rhyme and rhythm of the line (1927, 299).

[141] Brussich 1990, 29-32. That Cinesias is complaining of Timotheus' lyrics may be nothing more than the criticism of a jealous rival and need not mean that even other poets of the New Music hated Timotheus' style. For modern assessments of Timotheus' style, see n.73.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the history of Timotheus' earlier critical failures, and the opposition of many of the critics to the New Music, the reasons for Timotheus' victory are not immediately clear. The critics disliked the New Music, considering it "a direct assault on traditional values."[144] Damon, an influential critic associated with both Pericles and Socrates, whose theories regarding the ethical impact of music informed much of later criticism, equated a musical revolution with a social one (Plato, *Resp.* 424c). Damon's writings are lost but we can find a reflection of them in Plato, a follower of Damon who adopted and expanded many of his musical doctrines.[145] In the *Laws* we find a sharp condemnation of the musical qualities of the New Music and the resultant ethical problems (669c-670a; 700a-701a).[146]

---

[142] It is necessary to modify the dates for Timotheus' life slightly to c. 445-355. The length is determined by the *Suda* and the Parian marble, both of which record a long life for Timotheus (97 and 90 years respectively). The *Suda* also records that Timotheus was alive when Philip of Macedon was King (359-336). That there is no need to invent an association between Philip and Timotheus suggests that we are justified in accepting the association as fact. It is therefore necessary to date the death of Timotheus later than 360. This new date corresponds to Timotheus' associations with both Euripides and Archelaus, and to the reign of Philip of Macedon that the traditional dates (450-360) do not reflect.

[143] One dramatic break with earlier tradition is Timotheus' use of the direct speech of captured Persians.

[144] Csapo and Slater 1994, 334; they cite the "ideological oppositions" in the critics' comparisons of the New and the Old Music as evidence.

[145] For the extent to which Plato reproduced or expanded the doctrines of Damon, see Warren D. Anderson, "The Importance of Damonian Theory in Plato's Thought," *TAPA* 86 (1955): 88-102 and Carnes Lord, "On Damon and Musical Education," *Hermes* 100 (1978): 32-43.

Criticism of the New Music was not limited to the philosophers; it extended to members of the conservative elite who despaired not of the New Music's ethical repercussions, but of its aesthetics. Both Aristophanes and Pherecrates could mock the excesses of the New Music for laughs. Pherecrates presented on stage a disheveled Music who complained of the abuse she had suffered at the hands of various poets. Aristophanes too could get a laugh from the excesses of the New Music, presenting a lengthy aria of Agathon (*Frogs* 1309-64; see also *Thesm.* 101-29). Nevertheless, the hostility of the sources suggests that the general populace may have been attracted to the New Music.[147] Generally speaking, hostile reactions must be reactions to some provocation and time is not well spent reacting to something that is not an issue. That the philosophers and critics denounced the New Music implies that someone, perhaps some segment of the general populace, were reacting to the New Music with favour.

Timotheus took delight in the originality of his creations. In the *sphragis* (*PMG* 791.215-53) Timotheus repeatedly and defiantly proclaims the newness of his creation, first in a neat chiasmus referring to the Spartan charges against him (ὅτι παλαιοτέραν νέοις / ὕμνοις μοῦσαν ἀτιμῶ, "that I dishonour, with new music, the older Muse" [*PMG* 791.211-2]), then distancing himself from the corrupters of the old muse (μουσοπαλαιολύ/μας [*PMG* 791.216-7]) and finally declaring that he has rejuvenated

---

[146] See also *Republic* 395d-400a where Plato expressly condemns such distasteful topics as boastful women, women in labour, and the noisy descriptions of storms. West suggests that these refer to dithyrambs of Timotheus, in particular the *Niobe* (*PMG* 786), the *Birth-pangs of Semele* (*PMG* 792), and the *Nauplios* (*PMG* 785) (West 1992, 369 n.55).

[147] Csapo & Slater 1994, 334.

Music (*PMG* 791.241-5). That he continued to compose in that style, despite numerous critical failures, suggests a deep commitment to his aesthetic ideals.

His claims for the newness of his art is born out by the text itself; and we know the New Music was not all that very well liked by the conservative elite. The question then is why did Timotheus finally win? I contend that Timotheus presented, in a very novel and unusual style, which was enjoyed by the masses, a rather conventional account of the battle of Salamis. His narrative contains the standard scenes of Salamis, which include the role of Xerxes, the customary characterization of the Persians as effeminate, hierarchical, and obsessed with gold, and the superiority of Greece in contrast to Persia. The voices from the several different vantage points for the Persian disaster, the benches of the ships destroyed in battle (*PMG* 791.5-39; 86-97), the drowning Persian (*PMG* 791.40-85), the beachhead where the soldiers were waiting for death (*PMG* 791.98-161) and the hillside where Xerxes and his entourage watch (*PMG* 791.162-96), all convey the same sentiments of shock and terror at their decisive defeat. The New Music's freedom from the constraints of metre responsion allowed Timotheus to choose his vocabulary without regard for metrical requirements, while the license granted the musical aspect added an unprecedented aural component to his descriptions. These features combined to enhance Timotheus' conventional treatment of the content of the battle of Salamis that ensured his long-desired victory.

CONCLUSION

The Persian Wars were a watershed event for the Greek world and had a marked effect on the literary tradition. Poetry, the first literary form to commemorate significant events, reacted quickly to the Wars as various poets took up the challenge of creating a poetic response to the events. In addition to poetic epitaphs and allusions in poems devoted to other matters, we find evidence for lengthy narrative poems, treating events of the Wars in detail. I chose to focus on the longer poems since they provide a fuller treatment of the Wars. An analysis of the narrative poetry treating the Persian Wars can shed light on how the Wars and their participants were viewed by the Greeks and on the role of poetry.

Our best evidence is from Athens, for which we have a more extensive poetic record than we do for the other city-states. Here, we find that Athens could credit itself with the dominant role in the Persian Wars, often downplaying if not omitting outright the role of the allied city-states, and that a standard image of the Persians quickly formed.

In the earliest extant Athenian poetic account, Aeschylus' *Persae*, we find the first hints of what will become Athens' standard view of how the Wars were won: namely, that Athens took the leading role in the victory, if not single-handedly defeating the Persians. Although in his play, Aeschylus for the most part suppresses the name of "Athens," referring instead to the deeds of the "Greeks," the emphasis on Athens and its great accomplishment is nonetheless implicit in the play. The tragedy, written by an Athenian and performed primarily by Athenians, at Athens and for an audience largely composed of Athenians, cannot help but be imbued with an Athenian perspective. As the audience watched, they saw the Persians learn of the destruction of their forces at

Salamis, a primarily Athenian victory, with little emphasis being given to the final battles of Plataea and Mycale; the audience then saw the wreckage of Xerxes appear onstage, where he confirmed, in part visually, what had been previously narrated.

Pindar's ode for the Athenians (frr. 76-7 Maehler) seems to convey a similar emphasis on the single-handed role of Athens. His lavish description of Athens together with the explicit statement that the Athenians laid the "shining foundation of freedom" imply the omission of the deeds of the other city-states, as does his characterization of Athens as the "bulwark of Greece" and the alleged reaction of the Athenians who rewarded him handsomely with money and public honours. Timotheus' *Persians* too may fit into this tradition of the Athenians as the leading, if not sole, victors in the Wars. Although the Athenians are not mentioned in the extant text, the *Persians* nonetheless hints at the involvement of Themistocles in the victory. The first line may credit him explicitly with the victory, although this is not certain (*PMG* 788). Nevertheless, the *Persians* appears to preserve his speeches prior to the battle (*PMG* 789-90), giving him and so the Athenians a leading role in the victory. Choerilus' *Persica*, or perhaps one section of it, may bear the title *Athenians' Victory against Xerxes*, which suggests that it too gave prominence to the Athenian role; Choerilus' success with his poem at Athens strengthens this possibility.

The idea that Athens alone saved Greece was not confined to the poetic accounts. Instead, we find a more marked example of this view in the Attic orators, who credit Athens with single-handedly saving the Greek world at Marathon (e.g., [Lys.] 2.20-6; Dem. 40.10; Isoc. *Panath.* 49-52), and again at Salamis ([Lys.] 2.32-44; Dem. 40.10-11; Isoc. *Paneg.* 93-6 and *Panath.* 49-52). This commonplace speaks to the function of poetry to shape and preserve common knowledge, as the orators inherited from the poetic accounts the tradition of Athens' role in the Persian Wars.

One difference between the poets and the orators is that the orators tended to concentrate more on Marathon than on Salamis. This difference suggested to Nicole Loraux that there was a "systemic occultation" of Salamis, which was denigrated as the victory of the radical democracy rather than the aristocratic elite.[1] The poetic record, however, calls this into question. Poetic accounts of the battle of Salamis were common and popular in the immediate aftermath of the Wars, and in the later years. The reception of Choerilus' *Persica* at Athens, which may have seen repeated performances, supports the continuing popularity of Salamis. The popularity of Timotheus' *Persians*, implied by the familiarity of the Nemean audience ca. 207, suggests that Salamis did not fall out of favour. Although the *Persians* is the last poetic account of Salamis extant—it was first performed prior to 398 B.C.—there is evidence suggestive of other poetic treatments (e.g., the *Themistocles* of Moschion); unfortunately, we have only the titles, which does not allow us to conclude with certainty that the plays narrated the battle of Salamis.

In addition to conveying the dominant role of Athens in the Wars, the poetic record begins the creation of the Persians as the barbarian Other. The Persians appear as luxury-loving and decadent individuals, with their emphasis on rank and the trappings of wealth. They are depicted as hierarchical and often slavish as they prostrate themselves to their rulers. Aeschylus presents the Persians as somewhat effeminate, creating a Xerxes who indulges in womanish behaviour upon his defeat, mutilating his cheeks, beating his chest, and tearing his clothes and hair in what were considered feminine forms of mourning; that the Persians are ruled by a queen in the absence of Xerxes contributes to their effeminate portrayal.

---

[1] Loraux 1986, 161.

The loss of Phrynichus' plays on the topic does not allow us to conclude with confidence that Aeschylus invented the Barbarian as the anti-Greek. Nonetheless, the image of the Barbarian became standard in later accounts of the Persian Wars. Timotheus adopted the same image in his *Persians*, presenting a Xerxes who engaged in similar behaviour upon seeing the defeat of his forces at Salamis. If *SH* 329, in which a man is forced publicly to drink from substandard cups, preserves a banquet scene among the Persians, it too hints at the nature of the Persians: they are subject to their king, who can inflict public disgrace on them; a dishonour is conveyed through being compelled to drink from pottery cups, an image which gains force only if the other banqueters are seen to be using more opulent vessels.

In addition to conveying the image of the Persians as Barbarians, the Athenian poetic accounts of the Persian Wars shared a number of other common elements. Among them was the scene in which the Great King personally witnessed the defeat of his forces at Salamis. Aeschylus' *Persae* contains messenger speeches vividly describing the scene and the play culminates in the arrival onstage of Xerxes himself to lament the disaster further. Timotheus encapsulates the scene in a brief vignette which includes Xerxes' self-mutilation and his telling concern, in the midst of his retreat, for the gold that accompanied him. It is tempting to conclude that Choerilus too presented such a scene, but no fragments of it have been securely identified. That Simonides, in the preserved fragments, focuses on the Greek forces and gave little space to the Persians suggests that he might have omitted the scene in his account(s) of Salamis.

Furthermore, reference to Xerxes' yoking of the Hellespont was common to accounts of the Wars. Such a reference allowed for an emphasis on the *hubristic* nature of Xerxes, a man who would dare to attempt to subject the sea to his will. Aeschylus not only describes the yoking, but also puts a denunciation of it into the mouth of Darius, whom he creates as foil for Xerxes. By appropriating the voice of one Persian king to condemn the actions of another Persian king, Aeschylus increases the negative portrayal of the deed. Similarly, Timotheus refers to the yoking of the Hellespont, appropriating the voice of a drowning Persian who threatens the sea with further violence from the man who had once before yoked it. With this scene, Timotheus shows his condemnation of the action: he allows the Persian, having uttered his threats, to disappear, leaving the audience secure in the knowledge that the sea would be avenged.

One other shared motif in accounts of the Persian Wars was the gold and luxury which seem to have been standard characteristics of the Persians. The elaborate costuming of the Persian courtiers, Darius, and the Queen in Aeschylus' *Persae*, implied by the needed contrast with a defeated Xerxes, dressed in rags, reflects the luxurious element among the Persians. A similar emphasis is found in Timotheus, whose Xerxes retreats from Salamis only after making careful provision for the safe transport of the gold that accompanied him.

Turning from what we can learn from the poetic accounts of the Wars concerning the Athenians' perception of the Wars and their participants, we will now consider what we can deduce concerning the role of poetry. An examination of the poetic accounts suggests that they had three, somewhat interrelated, functions: they offered praise to the victors; commemorated the fallen; and served to shape and preserve the memory of events.

Praise of the victors and their accomplishments is inherent in all poetic accounts of the Wars. The earliest such accounts are those of Simonides and Pindar, composed for Spartan and Athenian audiences, or for panhellenic audiences. Both authors take a laudatory approach to their narratives, although Simonides' poems could include an element of lamentation for the fallen.

Poetry intended to praise the victors was not restricted to the lyric and elegiac forms. Instead, we find Aeschylus employing the genre of tragedy to offer praise to Athens for its victory at Salamis. In so doing, Aeschylus remained true to the form of tragedy: he presented the story of a lofty man brought low; depicted characters who interacted with other characters and a Chorus; and put on his play during the City Dionysia. That Athens caused the downfall of Xerxes does not argue against identifying the *Persae* as tragedy. In the first instance, genre can be determined by its venue; all non-satyr and non-comedic plays presented at the City Dionysia were tragedies. As well, drama differed from other dramatic genres by its lofty subject matter, and by its approach to its task: unlike the comic poet, the tragedian maintained a distance between himself and his topic, and himself and his audience. Aeschylus uses the tragic venue to offer public and communal praise to Athens for its victory at Salamis. He did this within the confines of the tragic genre, which could be seen to elicit some form of sympathy for the vanquished Xerxes.

The praise of Athens is found in the downfall, caused by Athens, of Xerxes and the implied consequent destruction of the Persian Empire. A broken Xerxes returns to his capital, where so far from being accorded the respect due his status as Great King, he is treated with familiarity and contempt by his courtiers who do not prostrate themselves, address him by bare name, without honorific, and chastise him for the defeat. Furthermore, the end of the play is imbued with funerary imagery, as Aeschylus suggests the death of the Persian Empire, resulting from the battle of Salamis.

Timotheus' *Persians* too is a poem in praise of Athens for its victory at Salamis. The Greeks are conspicuously absent in the final portion which is dominated by the defeated and dying Persians; nonetheless, the presence of the Greeks in the earlier portion is suggested by the fragments transmitted separately, which implies that the Greeks received their full measure of praise for the resulting destruction of the Persians. Furthermore, the narrative of the battle ends on a note of praise and thanksgiving for the Greek gods who helped to achieve the victory. That Timotheus performed his ode at Athens, and won a long-awaited victory for it, implies that the Athenians played a prominent role in the *Persians*. From this, we can conclude that the actions of the Athenians at Salamis were duly lauded.

In addition to its role of praising the victories, poetry had a redemptive role in its commemoration of significant events, often recasting defeats as victories. We see this in Simonides' poem for the fallen of Thermopylae (*PMG* 531), where the poet attempts to shape the reaction of the living to those who died there. Since Thermopylae was a disastrous defeat for the Spartans, Simonides must redeem that defeat, and recreate the fallen as victorious. Since he cannot say that Thermopylae was an outright victory, he instead turns it into a victory for the Spartan code. The ode, if complete, omits the cause of death, and instead focuses on the reward that awaits the fallen for their adherence to the martial values of Sparta: refusing to retreat, even in the face of certain death, the fallen are guaranteed a symbolic form of immortality by being enshrined in the memory of the living. If what has been preserved of his ode is not complete, we can perhaps infer that had Simonides mentioned the cause of the defeat, he would have done so in such a way as to enhance the glory of the fallen.

Simonides' Plataea ode displays a similar focus. Although Plataea was a victory rather than a disastrous defeat, it nonetheless entailed casualties. Here too Simonides' focus is on the reward of posthumous fame to be conferred on the dead. The ode was likely performed at a ceremony honouring the fallen, where the poet attempts to console the living with the thought that the dead, and the survivors of Plataea, have earned a symbolic immortality. Like Achilles, those who fought at Plataea can expect to receive undying *kleos*. In both the Thermopylae ode and the Plataea elegy, this immortal fame is made possible through poetry.

In both instances, Simonides' emphasis is on the reward earned by the dead rather than on lamenting their loss. Although they were likely performed relatively near in time to the deaths in question and were performed in circumstances accepting of lamentation, the element of lamentation takes a backseat to the elements of consolation and encomium. The families and city-states of the fallen are comforted with the knowledge that the dead were to be appropriately rewarded for their sacrifice.

Accounts of Artemisium may share this redemptive function of poetry. Artemisium was at best a stalemate that saw the destruction of much of the allied Greek fleet and that did not prevent the further advance of the Persians. Nevertheless, that Pindar could refer to the battle as the "shining foundation of freedom" implies that the image of Artemisium as a stalemate has been replaced by the image of the battle as not merely an important contribution to the ultimate victory, but rather the basis for it. Pindar's account would seem to suggest that without Artemisium, there would have been no Salamis.

Poetry also served to shape and preserve the knowledge of the Wars (e.g., Herodotus' account is indebted to those of Simonides and Aeschylus). The poets could recast losses, either of men or of battles, as victories, by emphasizing the reward earned by the fallen (e.g., *PMG* 531) or the contribution made even by battles whose military objectives were not met (e.g., frr. 76-7). Furthermore, the lengthy narratives conveyed information about the battles and the Wars; that these poems were public texts, performed before audiences of citizens, enabled them to spread knowledge of the Wars. That the Athenian poets presented a fairly standard, and influential, image of the Persians and the Wars and that the Attic orators adopted this image implies that poetry was a useful means to shape and preserve information.

This work has essentially been an examination of several authors who share a common trend: a poetic approach to aspects of the Persian Wars. The poems of Choerilus and Timotheus had been largely unexamined. Those of Simonides and Aeschylus have been more fortunate in scholarly attention and serve largely to offer *comparanda* for the works of the later poets. Through this analysis, we have seen the prominent role of poetry in Greek, albeit primarily Athenian, society. The poems acted to shape and preserve knowledge of the Persians and the Persian Wars, to convey praise, and to redeem, where necessary, disastrous results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I) TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES

Adler, Ada, ed. *Suidae Lexicon*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1971.

Allen, A., ed. *The Fragments of Mimnermus: Text and Commentary*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993.

Aloni, Antonio, ed. *Lirici Greci: Alcmane, Stesicoro, Simonide*. Milan: Arnaldo Mondavoni, 1994.

Barrett, W.S., ed. *Euripides: Hippolytus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.

Bernabé, A., ed. *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987.

Boas, M., ed. *De Epigrammatis Simonideis, Pars Prior: Commentatio Critica de Epigrammatum Traditione*. Groningen, 1905.

Braswell, B.K. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1981.

Broadhead, H.D., ed. *Persae of Aeschylus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Campbell, David A., ed. *Greek Lyric*. vol. 5. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

___________, ed. *Greek Lyric*. vol. 3. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991.

___________, ed. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. London: MacMillan, 1967. Reprint, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1982.

Colace, P. Radici, ed. *Choerili Samii Reliquae*. Rome: L'Erma, 1979.

Colona, Aristides, ed. *Himerii Declamationes et Orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis*. Rome: Typis Publicae Officiniae Polygraphicae, 1957.

Crawford, D.S., ed. *Papyri Michaelidae. Being a Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri, Tablets, and Ostraca in the Library of Mr. G.A. Michailides of Cairo*. Aberdeen: n.p., 1955.

Cropp, M.J., ed. *Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 2000.

Davies, Malcolm, ed. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Degani, Enzo and Gabriele Burzacchini, eds. *Lirici Greci Antologia.* Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1977.

Denniston, J.D. and D.L. Page, eds. *Aeschylus: Agamemnon.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.

Diehl, Ernest, ed. *Anthologia lyrica graeca.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1925.

Dover, Kenneth, ed. *Aristophanes: Frogs.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Drachmann, A.B, ed. *Scholia vetera in Pindari Carmina.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1903-17; reprint Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1966-9.

Dübner, F., ed. *Fragmenta Asii, Pisandri, Panyasidis, Choerili et Antimachi, post F.S. Lehrs, Hesiodi carmina.* Paris, 1841.

Easterling, P.E., ed. *Sophocles: Trachiniae.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Edmonds, J.M., ed. *Lyra Graeca.* vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.

___________, ed. *Lyra Graeca.* vol. 3. London: William Heinemann, 1927.

Edwards, M. and S. Usher, eds. *Greek Orators I: Antiphon & Lysias.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1985.

Foley, Helene P., ed. *Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Gentili, Bruno and Charles Prato, eds. *Poetarum Elegiacorum Testimonia et Fragmenta.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1979.

Gerber, D.E. *Euterpe. An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry.* Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1970.

Hall, Edith, ed. *Aeschylus: Persians.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996.

Henry, René, ed. *Photius: Bibliothèque.* Paris: Belles Lettres, 1962.

Hordern, J.H., ed. *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Jacobson, H., ed. *Exekiel: Exagoge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Janko, Richard, ed. *Philodemus, On Poems, Book 1.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

________. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Janssen, T.H., ed. *Timotheus, Persae: a Commentary*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1989.

Kaibel, G., ed. *Athenaeus: Dipnosophistae*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1963.

Kannicht, Richard, ed. *Euripides: Helena*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1969.

Kassel, R. and C. Austin, eds. *Poetae Comici Graeci*. 5 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983-2001.

Kinkel, G., ed. *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1877.

Kirk, G.S., ed. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons, eds. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.

Lobel, E. "2327: Early Elegiacs." *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 22 (1954): 67-76.

________ "2257: ὑποθεσις of a play, etc." *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 20 (1952): 66-9.

Lobel, E. and D. Page, eds. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Maehler, H., ed. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1987.

Marr, J.L., ed. *Plutarch: Themistocles*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998.

Mastronarde, Donald J., ed. *Euripides: Phoenissae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Matthews, Victor J., ed. *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

___________, ed. *Panyassis of Halikarnassos* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Murray, Penelope, ed. *Plato on Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Naeke, A.F., ed. *Choerili Samii quae supersunt*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1817.

Page, D.L., ed. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

________, ed. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.

________, ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Parsons, P.J. "3965. Simonides, Elegies." *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 59 (1992): 4-49.

Paley, F.A., ed. *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*. London, 1874.

Pfeiffer, R., ed. *Callimachus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.

Podlecki, Anthony J. *The Persians by Aeschylus*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Radt, Stefan, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. vol. 3. *Aeschylus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.

________, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. vol. 4. *Sophocles*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Reinach, T., ed. *Josephus: Contre Apion*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1930.

Richardson, N.J., ed. *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

Russell, D.A. and N.G. Wilson, eds. *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

Rutherford, Ian, ed. *Pindar's "Paeans": A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Schneidewin, F.W., ed. *Simonides Cei Carminum Reliquiae*. Brunswick, 1835.

Sider, David. "Fragments 1-22 W2: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 13-32.

Slater, William J., ed. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

Snell, Bruno, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

Tzschirner, J.P., ed. *Panyasidis Halicarnassei Heracleadis Fragmenta*. Bratislava, 1842.

Usener, Hermann and L. Radermacher, eds. *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1956.

van der Weiden, M.J., ed. *The Dithyrambs of Pindar*. Amsterdam: J.C. Geiben, 1991.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich, ed. *Timotheos Milesus, Die Perser*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1974.

________, ed. *Timotheus: Die Perser*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche, 1903a.

________, ed. *Der Timotheos-Papyrus: Lichtdruck-Ausgabe*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'che, 1903b.

Wernsdorf, Gottlieb, ed. *Himerii Sophiste, Quae reperiri potuerunt*. Gottingen, 1790.

West, M.L., ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. editio altera. vol 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

________. ed. *Aeschylus: Tragoedia*. Stuttgart, Teubner, 1990.

________, ed. *Euripides: Orestes*. Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1987.

________, ed. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

Willink, C.W., ed. *Euripides: Orestes*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

II) SECONDARY SOURCES

Agard, Walter R. "Boreas at Athens." *CJ* 61 (1966): 241-6.

Alexiou, Margaret. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Aloni, Antonio. "The Proem of the Simonides Elegy on the Battle of Plataea (Sim. Frs. 10-18W^2) and the Circumstances of its Performance." in Edmunds and Wallace 1997: 8-28, 130-6 (revised in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 86-105).

Anderson, Warren D. *Ethos and Education in Greek Music: the Evidence of Poetry and Philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Anhalt, Emily Katz. *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 1993.

Anti, C. "Il vaso di Dario e i Persiani di Frinico." *AC* 4 (1952): 23-45.

Aron, K. "Beiträge zu den *Persern* des Timotheos." diss. Greifswald, 1920.

Austin, Colin. "The *Wasps* of Aristophanes." Review of *Aristophanes: Wasps*, ed. Douglas M. MacDowell. *CR* n.s. 23 (1973): 133-5.

Badian, Ernst. "Phrynichus and Athens' οἰκήια κακά." *SCI* 15 (1990): 55-60.

________. "History from Square Brackets." *ZPE* 79 (1989): 51-70.

________. "Archons and *Strategoi*." *Antichthon* 5 (1971): 1-34.

Barigazzi, Adelmo. "Nuovi frammenti delle elegie di Simonide (Ox. Pap. 2327)." *MH* 20 (1963): 61-76.

________. "Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel Proemio degli Aitia di Callimaco." *Hermes* 84 (1956): 162-82.

Barker, Andrew. *Greek Musical Writings*. vol. 1. *The Musician and his Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Bassett, Samuel E. "The Place and Date of the First Performance of the *Persians* of Timotheus," *CP* 26 (1931): 153-65.

Beazley, J.D. "Hydria Fragments in Corinth." *Hesperia* 24 (1955): 305-19; plates 85-8.

Bernabé, A. "Quérilo y la Geranomaquia. Sobre el fr. 13 Colace (=14 Kinkel = *SH* 332)." *Emerita* 52 (1984): 319-23.

Berton, Pierre. *Vimy*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1986.

Bing, Peter. *The Well-Read Muse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1988.

Blundell, Mary Whitlock. *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophoclean Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Boedeker, Deborah. "Heroizing History: Simonides' Elegy on Plataea." ms. (=J. Papademetriou, ed. *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference [May 1994] of the Hellenic Society for Humanistic Studies*. Athens, 1995, 121-35).

________. "Paths to Heroization at Plataea." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 148-63 (=2001a).

________. "Heroic Historiograpy: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea. in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 120-134 (=2001b).

________. "The New Simonides and Heroization at Plataia. in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, eds. Nick Fisher and Hans van Wees. London: Duckworth, 1998: 231-49.

Boedeker, Deborah and David Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Boedeker, Deborah and David Sider. "Introduction." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 3-6.

Borthwick, E.K. "Notes on the Plutarch De Musica and the Cheiron of Pherecrates." *Hermes* 96 (1968): 60-73.

Bowie, A.M. "Tragic Filters for History: Euripides' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*." in Pelling 1997: 39-62.

Bowie, E.L. "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival." *JHS* 106 (1986): 13-35.

Bowra, C.M. *On Greek Margins*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

________. "Asius and the Old-fashioned Samians." in Bowra 1970: 122-33; = *Hermes* 85 (1957): 391-401.

________. "Xenophanes on the Luxury of Colophon." in Bowra 1970: 107-21; = *CQ* 60 (1944): 119-26..

________. *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. rev. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

________. "Simonides on the Fallen of Thermopylae." *CP* 28 (1933): 277-81.

Braccesi, Lorenzo, ed. *Tragici Greci e l'Occidente*. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 1979.

Bremer, J.M. "The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*." *Mnem.* 28 (1975): 268-80.

Brosius, Maria. *Women in Ancient Persia: 559-331 BC*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Brown, C.G. "Iambos." in Gerber 1997: 11-88.

Brunt, P.A. "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes." *CQ* n.s. 30 (1980): 477-94.

Brussich, Guerrino Francesco. "L'inno ad Artemide di Timoteo." *QUCC* 34 (1990): 25-38.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. trans. John Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Burn, A.R. *Persia and the Greeks*. London: Edward Arnold, 1962.

Burzacchini, G. "ἔσχατον δύεται κατὰ γᾶς (=Simon. 89P.)." *QUCC* 25 (1977): 31-41.

Cameron, Alan. *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Cataudella, Q. "Tragedi di Eschilo nella Siracusa di Gerone." *Kokalos* 10-11 (1964-1965): 371-98.

Chiron-Bistagne, Paulette. "A propos du 'Vase des Perses' au Musée de Naples. Une nouvelle interprétation?" in *Les Perses d'Eschyle (=Cahiers du GITA 7)*, eds. Paulette Chiron-Bistagne, Alain Moreau, and Jean-Claude Turpin. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry-Montpellier, 1992: 145-58.

Citti, V. "Il lenzuolo funebre della tirannide. A proposito di Simon. 89P." *Prometheus* 13 (1987): 11-12.

Colace, P. Radici. "Note a Cherilo di Samo." in *Scritti in honore di Salvatore Pugliatii*. vol. 5. *Scritti Vari*. Milan, 1978: 829-30.

________. "Un 'Locus desperatus' in Cherilo di Samo (Fr.8, 1N.)." *GIF* 27 (1975): 278-9.

Colvin, Stephen. "The Language of Non-Athenians in Old Comedy." in Harvey and Wilkins 2000: 285-98.

Conacher, D.J. *Aeschylus: The Earlier Plays and Related Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

________. "Aeschylus' Persae: A literary commentary." in Heller and Newman 1974: 143-68.

Croiset, Maurice. *Histoire de la literature grecque*. vol. 3 *Période Attique*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1935.

________. "Observations sur *Les Perses* de Timothée de Milet." *REG* 16 (1903): 323-48.

Cropp, Martin, Elaine Fantham, and S.E. Scully, eds. *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays Presented to D.J. Conacher*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.

Csapo, E. "Later Euripidean Music." *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000): 399-426.

Csapo, E. and W.J. Slater. *The Contexts of Ancient Drama.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Curtius, E.R. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. New York: Pantheon, 1953.

Dasen, Véronique. "Pygmaioi." *LIMC*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1994. vol. 7: 1. 594-601; vol 7: 2. 466-86.

Davies, Malcolm and Jeyaraney Kathirithamby. *Greek Insects*. London: Duckworth, 1986.

de Heer, C. *ΜΑΚΑΡ – ΕΥΔΑΙΜΩΝ – ΟΛΒΙΟΣ – ΕΥΤΥΧΗΣ: A Study of the Semantic Field Denoting Happiness in Ancient Greek to the end of the Fifth Century*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1969.

Denniston, J.D. *Greek Particles*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Depew, Mary and Dirk Obbink. "Introduction." in Depew and Obbink, 2000: 1-14.

Depew, Mary and Dirk Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Dihle, Albrecht. *History of Greek Literature*. trans. Clare Krojzl. London: Routledge, 1994.

Dornseiff, Franz. *Echtheitsfragen antik-griechischer literatur: rettungen des Theognis, Phokylides, Hekataios, Choirilos*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1939.

Dougherty, Carol. *Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Dover, K.J. *Greek Homosexuality*. rev. 2d ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Drews, Robert. *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Dunbar, Henry. *Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments of Aristophanes*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1883; revised and expanded by Benedetto Marzullo. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.

Düring, Ingemar. "Studies in Musical Terminology in 5th Century Literature." *Eranos* 43 (1945): 190-3.

Dworacki, Sylwester. "Some Remarks on the Greek Historical Tragedies." in Jerzy Axer and Woldeman Gürler, eds. *Scaenica Saravi-Varsoviensia: Beiträge zum antiken Theater und zu seinem Nachleben*. Warsaw, 1997. 19-25.

Easterling, P.E., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

________. "Constructing the Heroic." in Pelling 1997: 21-38.

Ebeling, H.L. "The Persians of Timotheus." *AJP* 46 (1925): 317-31.

Edmunds, Lowell and Robert W. Wallace, eds. *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Eichgrün, P.E. *Kallimachos und Apollonnios Rhodios*. Berlin: n.p., 1961.

Errington, R.M. *Philopoemen*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Evans, J.A.S. "Herodotus and the Gyges Drama." *Athenaeum* n.s. 33 (1955): 333-6.

Flower, M.A. "Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae." *CQ* 48 (1998): 365-79.

Forrest, W.G. *A History of Sparta: 950-192 B.C.* 2nd ed. London: Duckworth, 1980.

Fraenkel, Eduard. "Vermutungen zum Aetna-Fesspiel des Aeschylus." *Eranos* 52 (1954): 61-75.

________. "The Culex." *JRS* 42 (1952): 1-9.

Francis, E.D. "Greeks and Persians: the Art of Hazard and Triumph." in Schmandt-Besserat 1980: 53-86.

Gargiulo, Tristano. "Mare e vino nei *Persiani*: una congettura a Timoteo, fr. 791, 61-62 Page." *QUCC* 54 (1996): 73-81.

Gastaldi, Enrica Culasso. "Eschilo e l'Occidente." in Braccesi 1979: 17-89.

Gentili, Bruno and Roberto Pretagostini, eds. *Musica in Greca*. Rome: Laterza, 1988.

Georges, Pericles. *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience: From the Archaic Period to the Age of Xenophon*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Gerber, Douglas E., ed. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

________. "Elegy:" in Gerber 1997: 99-107.

________. "Greek Lyric Poetry since 1920 Part II: from Alcman to Fragmenta Adespota." *Lustrum* 36 (1994): 7-188.

Golden, Mark. *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Goodwin, William W. and Charles B. Gulick. *Greek Grammar*. Boston: Ginn, 1930; reprint, New Rochelle NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1992.

Gould, John. "Hiketeia." *JHS* 93 (1973): 74-103.

Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 11 (1915).

Hainsworth, J.B. *The Idea of Epic*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Hall, Edith. "Drowning by nomes: the Greeks, Swimming and Timotheus's *Persians*." in Khan 1994: 44-80.

________. "Asia unmanned: Images of victory in classical Athens." in *War and Society in the Greek World*. edd. John Rich and Graham Shipley. Routledge: New York, 1993. 108-33.

________. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford: Carendon, 1989.

Hammond, N.G.L. and Warren G. Moon. "Illustrations of Early Tragedy at Athens." *AJA* 82 (1978): 371-83.

Hansen, Ove. "The So-Called Prayer to the Fates and Timotheus's *Persae*." *RhM* 133 (1990): 190-2.

________. "On the Date and Place of the First Performance of Timotheus' *Persae*." *Philologus* 128 (1984): 135-8.

Harding, Philip. *Androtion and the "Atthis"*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Hartog, François. *The Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. trans. Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Harvey, A.E. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955): 157-75.

Harvey, David and John Wilkins, eds. *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London: Duckworth and Classical Press of Wales, 2000.

Heller, John L. and J.K. Newman, eds. *Serta Turyniana*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974.

Herington, John. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Hirzl, R. "Die Thukydideslegende." *Hermes* 13 (1878): 46-9.

Hollis, A.S. "The Reputation and Influence of Choerilus of Samos." *ZPE* 130 (2000): 13-15.

Hordern, J.H. "Some Observations on the *Persae* of Timotheus (*PMG* 791)." *CQ* 49 (1999): 433-8.

Huxley, G.L. *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969(a).

________. "Choirilos of Samos." *GRBS* 10 (1969[b]): 12-29.

Irwin, Eleanor. *Colour Terms in Greek Poetry*. Toronto: Hakkert, 1974.

Jauss, Hans-Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." *New Literary History* 2 (1970): 7-37.

Kaempf-Dimitriadou, Sophia. "Boreas." *LIMC*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1994. vol. 3: 1.133-42 and 3: 2.108-22.

Kamerbeek, J.C. "De nuovo fragmento tragico in quo de Gyge et Candaule agitur." *Mnem.* 5 (1952): 108-15.

Kegel, W.J.H.F. *Simonides*. J.B. Wolters: Groningen, 1962.

Kenyon, F. "Greek Papyri and Classical Literature." *JHS* 39 (1919): 1-15.

Khan, H.A, ed. *The Birth of the European Identity: the Europe-Asia Contrast in Greek Thought 490-32 BC*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press, 1994.

Körte, Alfred. "Literarische Texte mit Ausscluß der christlichen." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 7 (1924): 114-60.

Korzeniewski, Dietmar. "Die Binnenresponsion in den *Persern* des Timotheos." *Philologus* 118 (1974): 22-39.

Kraus, Christina Shuttleworth, ed. *Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.

Landels, John G. *Music in Ancient Greece and Rome*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Laroche, E. *Histoíre de la racine NEM- en grec áncien.* Paris: Librairie C. Klinchsieck, 1949.

Latte, Kurt. "Ein antikes Gygesdrama." *Eranos* 48 (1950): 136-41.

Lattimore, Richmond. "Aeschylus on the Defeat of Xerxes." in *Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1943: 82-93.

Lazenby, J.F. *The Defence of Greece: 490-479 B.C.* Warminster, Aris & Phillips, 1993.

Lefkowitz, Mary. *Lives of the Greek Poets*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Lesky, Albin. *Greek Tragic Poetry*. trans. Matthew Dillon. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

________. *A History of Greek Literature*. trans. James Willis and Cornelis de Heer. 2d ed. London: Methuen, 1966.

Lloyd-Jones, H. "Problems of Greek Tragedy: Pratinas and Phrynichus." in *Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy: the Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. 225-37.

________. "Simonides *PMG* 531." *CR* n.s. 24 (1974): 1.

Lobel, E. "A Greek Historical Drama." *PBA* 35 (1949): 207-16.

Long, Timothy. *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*. Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

Loraux, Nicole. *Mothers in Mourning with the Essay 'Of Amnesty and its Opposite.'* trans. Corinne Pache. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998.

________. *The Invention of Athens: the Funeral Oration in the Classical City.* trans. Alan Sheridan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

MacFarlane, Kelly. "Bacchylides *Absolvens*: the Defeat of Alexidamus in Bacchylides 11." in *Celebratio: Thirtieth Anniversary Essays at Trent University*, eds. J.P.

Bews, I.C. Storey, and M.R. Boyne. Peterborough, Ont.: Trent University Press, 1998. 42-50.

Malkin, Irad. *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Martin, Victor. "Drame historique ou tragédie? Remarques sur le nouveau fragment tragique relatif à Gygès." *MH* 9 (1952): 1-9.

Marzi, Giovanni. "Il decreto degli Spartani contro Timoteo (Beoth. 'de instit. Mus.' 1.1)." in Gentili and Pretagostini, 1988: 164-272.

Mathiesen, Thomas J. *Apollo's Lyre: Greek Music and Musical Theory in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Miller, E. *Mélanges de Litérature Grecque*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965.

Miller, Margaret C. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Molyneux, John H. *Simonides: A Historical Study*. Wauconda, Ill.: Bolchazy-Carducchi, 1992.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. *The Development of Greek Biography*. 2d ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Morris, Ian. *Death Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Morrison, J.M., J.F. Coates, and N.B. Rankov. *The Athenian Trireme: the History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Most, Glenn W. "Generating Genres: The Idea of the Tragic." in Depew and Obbink, 2000: 15-36.

Mülder, D. "Choirilos von Samos, ein poetische Quelle Herodots." *Klio* 7 (1907): 29-44.

Munn, Mark. *The School of History: Athens in the Age of Socrates*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Murray, Penelope. "Poetic inspiration in Early Greece." *JHS* 101 (1981): 87-100.

Nouhaud, Michel. *L'Utilisation de l'histoire par les Orateurs Attiques*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1982.

O'Brien, M.J. "The Authenticity of *Orestes* 1503-1536." in Cropp, Fantham, and Scully 1986: 213-27.

Obbink, Dirk. "The Genre of *Plataea*: Generic Unity in the New Simonides." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 65-85.

________. "The Hymnic Structure of the New Simonides." *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 193-203.

Ostwald, Martin. *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Page, D.L. "Poetry and Prose: Simonides, *P.M.G.* 531, Ibycus 298." *CR* n.s. 21 (1971): 317-8.

________. *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

Parsons, Peter. "'These Fragments we have Shored against our Ruin." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 55-64.

Pavese, C.O. "Elegia di Simonide agli Spartiati per Platea." *ZPE* 107 (1995): 1-26.

Pearson, L. *Local Historians of Attica*. Philadelphia: Lancaster, 1942.

Pelling, Christopher. *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*. London: Routledge, 2000.

________, ed. *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

________. "Aeschylus' *Persae* and History." in Pelling 1997: 1-19.

________. "Conclusion." in Pelling 1997: 213-35.

________. "Plutarch's adaptation of his source-material." *JHS* 100 (1980): 127-40.

Pickard-Cambridge, Arthur. *Dithyramb, Tragedy, and Comedy*. 2d ed. rev. T.B.L. Webster. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Podlecki, Anthony J. *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996; 2d ed. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1999.

________. *Life of Themistocles: A Critical Survey of the Literary and Archaeological Evidence*. Montreal: McGill-Queens, 1975.

________. "Simonides: 480." *Historia* 17 (1968): 257-75.

Porter, John R. *Studies in Euripides' "Orestes."* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Raubitschek, Anton E. "The Phoinissai of Phrynichos." *Tyche* 8 (1993): 143-4.

Reinach, T. "Les Perses de Timothée." *REG* 16 (1903): 62-83.

Robbins, Emmet. "Public Poetry: Simonides," in Gerber 1997: 243-252.

Roisman, Joseph. "On Phrynichos' *Sack of Miletos* and *Phoenissai*." *Eranos* 86 (1988): 15-23.

Rosenbloom, D. "Shouting 'Fire' in a Crowded Theatre: Phrynichos' *Capture of Miletos* and the Politics of Fear in Early Attic Tragedy." *Philologus* 137 (1993): 159-96.

Rutherford, Ian. "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary." in Boedeker and Sider 2001: 33-54.

________. "The New Simonides: Towards a Commentary." *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 169-71.

________. "Pindar on the Birth of Apollo." *CQ* 38 (1988): 65-75.

Saïd, Edward. *Orientalism*. 2d ed. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Heleen. "The Persian Kings and History." in Kraus 1999: 91-112.

Schachter, Albert. "Simonides' Elegy on Plataia: the Occasion of its Performance." *ZPE* 123 (1998): 25-30.

Schmandt-Besserat, Denise, ed. *Ancient Persia: the Art of an Empire*. Malibu: Udena, 1980.

Schmid, W. and O. Stälin. *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* I.ii. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1934.

Schmid, W. *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur* I. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1929.

Shaw, P.J. "Lords of Hellas, Old Men of the Sea: the Occasion of Simonides' Elegy on Plataea." in Boedeker and Siser 2001: 164-81.

Simon, Erika. "Boreas und Oreithyia auf dem silbernen Rhyton in Triest." *A&A* 13 (1967): 101-26.

Slater, W.J. "Symposium at Sea." *HCSP* 80 (1976): 161-70.

Smyth, H.W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

________. *Greek Melic Poets*. London: MacMillan, 1906.

Snell, B. "Gyges und Kroisos als Tragödien-Figuren." *ZPE* 12 (1973): 197-205.

Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. *'Reading' Greek Death to the end of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Stehle, Eva. "Help me to Sing, Muse, of Plataea." *Arethusa* 29 (1996): 205-22.

Steiner, D. "To Praise, not to Bury: Simonides fr. 531P." *CQ* 49 (1999): 383-95.

Stella, L.A. "Studi Simonidei I: Per la cronologia di Simonide." *RFC* n.s. 24 (1946): 1-24.

Suleiman, S.R. "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism." in Suleiman, S.R. and I. Crosman, eds. *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980: 3-45.

Taillardat, Jean. *Les images d'Aristophane*. Paris, 1965.

Taplin, O. "The Pictoral Record." in Easterling 1997: 69-90.

________. *Stagecraft of Aeschylus: the Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

Thomas, Rosalind. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Treadgold, Warren T. *Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1980.

Trendall, A.D. and T.B.L. Webster. *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London: Phaidon, 1971.

Tronson, Adrian. "Satyrus the Peripatetic and the Marriages of Philip II." *JHS* 104 (1984): 116-26.

Usher, Stephen. *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

van Minnen, Peter. "The Performance and the Readership of the *Persai* of Timotheus." *Archiv für Papyrosforshung* 43 (1997): 246-60.

Villanueva-Puig, Maria-Christine. "Le vase des Perses: Naples 3253 [inv. 81947]." *REA* 91 (1989): 277-98.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. *Aischylos: Interpretationem* Berlin, 1914.

________. *Sappho und Simonides: untersuchungen über griechische lyriker*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913.

________. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1 (1906).

Walters, R.K. "We Fought Alone at Marathon: Historical Falsification in the Attic Funeral Oration." *RhM*. 124 (1981): 206-11.

Webster, T.B.L. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London: Methuen, 1967.

West, M.L. "Simonides Redivivius." *ZPE* 98 (1993): 1-14.

________. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

________. "The Early Chronology of Attic Tragedy." *CQ* 39 (1989): 251-4.

________. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

________. Review of *Choerili Samii Reliquae*, ed. P. Radici Colace. *CR* 31 (1981): 104-5.

________. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.

________. "Melica." *CQ* 20 (1970): 205-15.

________. "Prose in Simonides." *CQ* 17 (1967): 113.

West, William C. III. "Saviors of Greece." *GRBS* 11 (1970): 271-82.

Ziegler, K. *Das hellenistische Epos*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1966.

Ziolkowski, John E. *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens*. New York: Arno Press, 1981.

Zuntz, G. *The Political Plays of Euripides*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1955.

APPENDIX A: AESCHYLUS' *AETNAEAE*

Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* (*TrGF* F 6-11), produced ca. 475, may have been specifically commissioned by Hieron to celebrate his founding of the city of Aetna (476/475) and as part of his campaign to legitimize his new city. The *Life* of Aeschylus states that the poet went to Sicily when Hieron was founding Aetna and produced the *Aetnaeae* as a good omen for the citizens (οἰωνιζόμενος βίον ἀγαθὸν τοῖς συνοικίζουσι τὴν πόλιν [9]). While we cannot be sure whether it was Aeschylus' intent or Hieron's specific commission, it is interesting that the *Life* records a possible political nature for the play.

What is more interesting about the play is its possible attempt at smoothing relations between the native Sicilians and the colonists. Diodorus records that the foundation of Aetna involved Hieron's forcible removal to Leontini of the original inhabitants and the subsequent installation at Aetna of his own settlers (11.49). *POxy.* 2257 preserves part of the hypothesis to the *Aetnaeae* and indicates that the play shifted scenes from Aetna, Leontini, and Syracuse from act to act.[1] This scene-jumping between the town Hieron founded to the town where he moved the indigenous population to his own seat of political power suggests that the play was set in the contemporary world and recorded the contemporary founding of Aetna. Oxyrhynchus has also provided us with fragments of the *Aetnaeae*.[2] In P.Oxy 2256 fr. 9, the character of Dike talks with the citizens of a city to which Zeus had sent her. The presence of Dike, sent by Zeus to Aetna as a mark of favour for the citizens, further suggests the political element of the play.

---

[1] κ(ατὰ) μ(ὲν) γ(ὰρ) τὸ πρῶτον μ‹έρος› αὐτοῦ ἡ σκηνὴ ὑ(πο)κε[ι]τ(αι) Αἴτνη κ(ατὰ) δ(ὲ) τὸ δεύτ(ερον) Ξουθία, κ(α)τ(ὰ) δὲ [τ]ὸ τρίτον πάλιν Αἴτνη, εἶτ᾽ ἀπὸ ταύτης εἰς Λε]οντίνους μ(ε)τ(ὰ) δ᾽ αὐτὸν Συρακοῦσαι, "the first scene is at Aetna, the second at Xothia, the third is back at Aetna, and then the Syracusans go to Leotini."

[2] Eduard Fraenkel, "Vermutungen zum Aetna-Fesspiel des Aeschylus," *Eranos* 52 (1954): 61, identified the fragment as part of the *Aetnaeae*. His analysis has been widely accepted. Cf. Q. Cataudella, "Tragedi di Eschilo nella Siracusa di Gerone," *Kokalos* 104 (1964-65): 331-98.

Enrica Culasso Gastaldi argues that the plot centered on the origins of the Palici, autochthonous Sicilian deities. According to Gastaldi, Aeschylus re-wrote the myth, making the Palici the children of the Sicilian nymph Thalia and Zeus, thus subordinating the indigenous goddess and her children to the Greek god. Thalia and her children are no longer autochthonous gods, nor even native gods but instead, having been subsumed into Greek religion and culture, are the children of Zeus and members of the Greek hierarchy. Zeus' conquest of the native Sicilian gods legitimized Hieron's appropriation of Aetna.[3] The name "Palici" is derived from πάλιν ἱκέσθαι, the children who returned to the light.[4] Like the gods, the settlers are those who have returned to their proper place; as such they are not invaders but the rightful owners. Indeed, "the birth of the Palici, that is the origin of their cult, is predicated upon the Greek settlement of Aetna."[5] As Gastaldi notes "[t]enta na 'grecizzazione' dei Palici sia per recuperare, assimilandolo, l'elemento non greco, sia soprattutto per sottrarre a eventuali moviementi indipendentistici il pericoloso vessillo dell' autoctonia."[6] By producing the *Aetnaeae* on the public stage in Syracuse, Aeschylus began the process of revising Sicilian history to accommodate the Greek colonists. While not necessarily overtly historical (the lack of fragments prevents us from knowing to what extent, if at all, Hieron entered into the play) the *Aetnaeae* illustrates an interest in putting current events on the public stage, and an acceptance of the role of public poetry in commemorating contemporary events.

---

[3] Enrica Culasso Gastaldi, "Eschilo e l'Occidente," *Tragici Greci e l'Occidente*, ed. Lorenzo Braccesi, Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 1979, 57-8. Thalia, daughter of Hephaestus and pregnant by Zeus, sought to hide her pregnancy from a vengeful Hera. Her prayers were answered when the ground opened up and took her in; later, the ground re-opened to emit the Palici. Carol Dougherty examines the imagery of rape and marriage within colonial narrative: poets legitimize the violence inherent in colonialism and imperial expansion by disguising it as erotic conquest (*Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1993], 65-77).

[4] ἦ καὶ Παλικῶν εὐλόγως μένει φάτις; / πάλιν γὰρ ἵκουσ' ἐκ σκότου τόδ' εἰς φάος, "what is the story of the Palici? They came back from the darkness to the light" (Aeschylus *TrGF* F 6.3-4)

[5] Dougherty 1993, 90.

[6] Gastaldi 1979, 66.

APPENDIX B: THE *SUDA* S.V. CHOERILUS OF SAMOS

> Χοιρίλος, Σάμιος, [τινὲς δὲ Ἰασέα], ἄλλοι δὲ Ἁλικαρνασέα ἱστοροῦσι. γενέσθαι δὲ κατὰ Πανύασιν τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Περσικῶν, ὀλυμπιάδι οέ, νεανίσκον ἤδη εἶναι· δοῦλόν τε Σαμίου τινὸς αὐτὸν γενέσθαι, εὐειδῆ πάνυ τὴν ὥραν· φυγεῖν τε ἐκ Σάμου καὶ Ἡροδότῳ τῷ ἱστορικῷ παρεδρεύσαντα λόγων ἐρασθῆναι· οὗτινος αὐτὸν καὶ παιδικὰ γεγονέναι φασίν. ἐπιθέσθαι δὲ ποιητικῇ καὶ τελευτῆσαι ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ παρὰ Ἀρχελάῳ, τῷ τότε αὐτῆς βασιλεῖ. ἔγραψε δὲ ταῦτα· τὴν Ἀθηναίων νίκην κατὰ Ξέρξου· [ἐφ᾽ οὗ ποιήματος κατὰ στίχον στατῆρα χρυσοῦν ἔλαβε] καὶ σὺν τοῖς Ὁμήρου ἀναγινώσκεσθαι ἐψηφίσθη· [Λαμιακά·] καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα αὐτοῦ φέρεται. (*SH* 315)[1]
>
> Choerilus the Samian, [some say the Iasian], others say that he is from Halicarnassus. He lived during the time of Panyassis and was a young man during the Persian wars, in the 75th Olympiad [480-477]; he was the slave of some Samian, and was very handsome. They say he fled from Samos and, sitting at the side of the historian Herodotus, whose *paidika* he was, loved literature. He composed poetry and died in Macedon at the court of Archelaus, when Archelaus was king. He wrote these things: *the Athenians' Victory Against Xerxes* [for which he received one gold *stater* per line] and which was voted to be recited along with the poems of Homer; the [*Lamiaca*]; and some other poems as well.

The *Suda*'s entry for Choerilus of Samos follows that of the tragedian, Choerilus of Athens. There is no entry for Choerilus of Iasus and there is some confusion as to what information in this entry belongs to which poet. It is impossible to determine when or where the confusion began. Nevertheless, the phrase τινὲς...ἄλλοι, "some…others" suggests that the *Suda*'s compiler(s) or source(s) jumbled the tradition for at least two individual authors rather than that they displaced a separate entry for the Iasian and later incorporated it into the entry for the Samian poet.

---

[1] Lloyd-Jones and Parsons accept Naeke's identification of certain elements as belonging to Choerilus of Iasus, and bracket the suspect material. A. Adler prints the text as transmitted but notes Naeke's objections in the apparatus. (ed., *Suidae Lexicon* [Stuttgart, Teubner: 1971])

An Iasian Choerilus was Alexander the Great's known associate and laudator. Since the testimonia for Choerilus of Iasus uniformly describe him as "pessimus poeta," "the worst poet" (*SH* 333) we can reject with confidence the suggestion that our Choerilus, who won great fame through his poetry, was himself the Iasian. A scholiast on Horace preserves *ad Ep.* 2.1.233 an anecdote in which the Iasian Choerilus is awarded one *stater* per good poetic line: "Choerilus poeta gesta Alexandri Magni describens, licet in tanto opere non amplius quam VII versus probos composuisset, tamen pro singulis singulos Philippeos, id est nummos aureos, accepit," "The poet Choerilus, describing the deeds of Alexander the Great, in which poem it is possible that he wrote no more than seven good lines, received individual Philippos, that is gold coins, for individual lines" (cf. Porph. *ad. AP* 357); this allows us to reject the line recording a similar result for Choerilus' *Persica*. There is only one seven-line fragment of Choerilus of Iasus extant (*SH* 335) and although it is possible that more lines lurk in the *fragmenta dubia* currently ascribed to Choerilus of Samos (*SH* 329-32) it is unlikely that they will ever be conclusively identified. This paucity of evidence, and changing literary tastes prevent us from agreeing confidently with the ancient critics' assessment of Choerilus' literary merits.

Naeke rejects *Lamiaca* as a work of Choerilus of Samos: with the dearth of Lamian myth and on analogy with the Rhianus' *Messeniaca* such a poem could only record the Lamian war (323-322) and thus must antedate the life of Choerilus; it would, however, be possible for the Iasian Choerilus.[2] D. Mülder prefers to emend the text to read *Samiaca*, a poem on the legendary foundation of Samos, and claims the poem for our Choerilus.[3]

---

[2] Naeke 1817, 101.

A fragment of the *Samiaca* may be extant: νηῦς δέ τις ὠκύπορος Σαμίη συὸς εἶδος ἔχουσα, "some swift-moving Samian ship having the appearance of a pig" (*SH* 322). This fragment, however, may be from the *Persica*. During the Battle of Mycale, the Samians deserted from the Persians and began to fight on the side of the Greeks (Hdt. 9.103-4). Choerilus could be expected to include the achievements of his countrymen in his account of the Wars. Given the absence both of securely identifiable fragments of a *Samiaca* and of references to such a poem in the ancient sources, the *Suda*'s confusion of our Choerilus and the Iasian, and the substantial change required to emend a Λ (λ) to a Σ (σ), I prefer to retain the reading Λαμιακά and accept Naeke's rejection of it as the title of a poem by Choerilus.

---

[3] D. Mülder, "Choirilos von Samos, ein poetische Quelle Herodots," *Klio* 7 (1907): 42-3. Huxley accepts Mülder's emendation, albeit with reservations (1969, 23).